

Extralinguistic factors influencing Indonesian language learning in France

Protasius Isyudanto, Myrna Laksman-Huntley*

Abstract: The Indonesian language is becoming increasingly important globally, creating a growing demand for its instruction, including in France. However, learners often face difficulties due to interference between their mother tongue and the Indonesian language they are learning. While some papers offered solutions to overcome these difficulties, these have tended to concentrate on the linguistic aspects and have overlooked the extralinguistic aspects. This paper seeks to address the issue by examining the extralinguistic aspects found in recordings of 10 Indonesian sentences containing phonemes expected to trigger pronunciation errors and spoken by three Malay-Indonesian studies students from different academic years at the Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales (INALCO), from three different college levels. The data was collected through three separate interviews, including the recording of the aforementioned sentences and a discussion about the subjects' linguistic background. The result was then examined to highlight the extralinguistic and linguistic factors affecting the production of interference. Afterwards, this paper then offers pedagogical suggestions. The study mainly uses phonemic interference and language learning theory, as well as theories related to the psychological and socio-cultural aspects of language learning. This research found that motivation and learning strategy are the two most important variables in the psychological aspect, while input and feedback are the most important aspects in the socio-cultural aspect. Nevertheless, the most decisive factor in Indonesian mastery is the duration of learning.

Keywords: *Advanced reading ability; fourth graders; low reading ability*



AFFILIATION

Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author:

✉ laksman@ui.ac.id

ARTICLE HISTORY

- Received 25 August 2025
- Accepted 17 September 2025
- Published 30 September 2025

CITATION (APA STYLE)

Isyudanto, P., & Laksman-Huntley, M. (2025). Extralinguistic factors influencing Indonesian language learning in France. *Diksi*, 33(2). <https://doi.org/10.21831/diksi.v33i2.89389>

INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian language is spoken by over 300 million people globally, making it the 10th most spoken language (Grehenson, 2022), and the demand for teaching Indonesian has increased due to its globalisation and people's increased multilingualism (Eberhard et al., 2019). *Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing* (BIPA), a program designed to teach Indonesian to non-native speakers through linguistic and cultural instruction, was established for foreign language learners of Indonesian, including in France. There are at least five universities in France with an Indonesian studies program, while the Indonesian Embassy's Indonesian class was attended by 116 students in the second half of 2024 alone (Telkom University, 2024).

As in any other foreign language learning, learning Indonesian is subject to a linguistic phenomenon in which the structure of the learner's first language affects the production of the target language. This is defined by Weinreich (2010) as interference, a phenomenon he

categorized into two groups according to their factors: (1) non-structural, or extralinguistic factors, and (2) structural, which is related to linguistic factors.

There are three extralinguistic aspects that impact the level of interference: (1) learning process, (2) psychological and (3) socio-cultural. In the first aspect, there are several factors which are considered: learnt languages, duration of Indonesian learning, frequency of Indonesian learning, methods of Indonesian learning and frequency of Indonesian production, all of which are self-explanatory (Saville-Troike, 2006). Ruskin (2016) states that interference can happen in every level of learning, but as the mastery of the language increases, interference tends to decrease, a phenomenon that is affirmed by Nasaruddin's (2017) study of interference from Arabic to Indonesian, Schmidt's (2018) research on Dutch-French bilingual speakers and Rafael's (2019) analysis of interference from the Malay dialect of Kupang to Indonesian.

Psychological factors influencing language learning include age, sex, motivation, learning strategy, and personality. Age is divided into childhood (up to two years old) and adulthood, offering different advantages like plasticity and analytical skills, respectively (Saville-Troike, 2006). Females excel in verbal fluency and memory, while males excel in symmetrical mental organization and computational skills. Motivation can be integrative (adopting the target community's culture) or instrumental (goal-oriented) (Al-Hoorie & Macintyre, 2019). Learning strategies include metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective approaches. Personality is measured using five major factors (Teimouri et al., 2022): neuroticism, extroversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Each factor reflects different traits such as emotionality, sociability, curiosity, harmony-seeking, and discipline.

In respect of socio-cultural aspects, there are several factors: limitation, identity, social category, learning environment as well as input and feedback (Saville-Troike, 2006; Weinreich, 2010). Limitation in this context refers to anything that could limit one's ability to learn a language, either personal or institutional. Identity means one's cultural features that align with the target language or target community. The more similar one's identity to that of the target language or community, the better the motivation to learn the language tends to be. Next, social category refers to attributions, such as economical or racial background, that could affect one's opportunity of learning. Lastly, input and feedback represent one's frequency of exposure towards the target language and feedback to better one's production of the target language. As an additional note, French native speakers tend to maintain the purity of their language, including its phonetic production (Gallix, 2013), hence creating a socio-cultural background that makes interference even more likely.

Apart from non-structural factors, structural aspects also affect interfer-

ence. It is divided into three categories: (1) phonic, (2) lexical and (3) grammatical. Phonic interference is the disturbance in verbal production, lexical interference is the disturbance in word production, while grammatical interference is the disturbance in syntax production of the target language.

Weinreich (2010) describes four manifestations of phonic interference, namely the under-differentiation of phonemes, over-differentiation of phonemes, reinterpretation of distinctions and phone substitution. The under-differentiation of phonemes happens when two different phones in the target language are not differentiated in the first language. Alternately, over-differentiation of phonemes occurs when two different phones in the first language are not differentiated in the target language. The third type of phonic interference is the reinterpretation of distinctions where one differentiates the phoneme of a target language by employing one's native language structure. Lastly, phone substitution applies to phonemes that are identically defined in two languages but whose normal pronunciation differs.

In analyzing French to Indonesian phonic interference in its linguistic context, a comparative analysis between the first language (French) and the target language (Indonesian) is necessary. This research uses Léon's theory of French phonemes (1992) and Chaer's theory of Indonesian phonemes as reference (2009). Based on these theories, the consonants in Indonesian are /p/, /b/, /m/, /t/, /d/, /n/, /k/, /g/, /ɲ/, /v/, /z/, /f/, /s/, /ʃ/, /l/, /w/, /j/, /ʔ/, /c/, /ɟ/, /x/, /h/, /ŋ/ and /r/ while in French they are /p/, /b/, /m/, /t/, /d/, /n/, /k/, /g/, /ɲ/, /v/, /z/, /ʒ/, /f/, /s/, /ʃ/, /l/, /R/, /w/, /ʔ/ and /j/. The vowels in Indonesian include /i/, /u/, /e/, /o/, /ə/, /a/, /aw/, /oj/ and /aj/ while in French they include /i/, /y/, /u/, /e/, /ø/, /o/, /ə/, /ɛ/, /œ/, /ɔ/, /a/, /ɑ/, /ẽ/, /œ̃/, /õ/ and /ã/.

Considering the facts mentioned above, Indonesian phonemes absent in French could cause interference and French speakers consequently replace them with the closest phonemes in their native language (Weinreich, 2010). For example, the absence of /ʔ/, voiceless glottal consonant, leads to /k/, voiceless velar plosive substitution. Additionally, /c/, voiceless lamino prepalatal plosive is not recognized in French, resulting in [k], velar plosive, or [ʃ], predorso prepalatal fricative, pronunciation. The absence of /ɟ/, voiced lamino pre-palatal plosive, leads to /z/, voiced predorso prepalatal fricative, substitution, and /x/, voiceless dorso velar fricative is replaced by /k/, voiceless velar plosive. French speakers would probably ignore /h/, while [ŋ] tends to be pronounced with an additional [g] phone afterwards which is common in European language, including in French speakers (Adityarini et al., 2020). French used to have the phoneme /r/, before it was formally removed from the language in the 18th century (Straka, 1965), placing /R/ as a possible replacement. French does not have diphthongs like Indonesian which has three of them. This research takes into account both non-structural and structural forms of linguistic interference in subjects whose first language is French and whose target language is Indonesian,

with a primary focus on the non-structural or extralinguistic aspects.

There are several previous studies that have similar context to French phonic interference with respect to Indonesian. Some have examined first language interference in French acquisition, including Rohali (2018) and Meidi & Laksman-Huntley (2020) on Indonesian-French interference, Meziane & MacLeod (2021) on Arabic-French interference, and Taqiyya & Widayanti (2021), who analyzed six learners with distinct first language backgrounds: Indian, Japanese, Korean, Malay, Mandarin, and Vietnamese. There are other works that equally study the interference of certain languages towards Indonesian. Aside from the mentioned study of Adityarini et al. (2020), Lestari (2021) also probes French to Indonesian interference. Some other studies focus on other languages. For example, Nwode et al. (2022) analyses the interference from the Igbo language to English while Capliez (2016) probes the effect of English to French. On the topic of extralinguistic aspects, Jafarova's (2021) article analyzes Persian to English interference.

Through review of these studies, this research is similar to that of Lestari's (2021) and Lantika & Cholsy's (2023), investigating the phonic interference of French with respect to Indonesian. However, their studies are dedicated solely to the various linguistic aspects giving rise to interference, like many other studies examining interference. The objective of this study is, conversely, to analyze phonic interference of French with respect to Indonesian considering extralinguistic factors, which are (1) learning process, (2) psychological and (3) socio-cultural aspects, eventually contributing to pedagogical strategies to effectively reduce phonic interference.

METHOD

The subjects are composed of three native French speakers fulfilling the criteria of being a current student at the Malaysian-Indonesian department at the Institut national des arts, langues et civilisations orientales (INALCO). The first subject is a female student in the first year and shall be referred as subject A. The second subject is a male second year student and shall be referred as subject B. The last subject is a male student in the third year and shall be referred to as subject C. Subject A and C have never lived in an Indonesian-speaking community while subject B did so for five months in 1996. The subjects' average age is 32 and they were chosen because of their study year difference at the Malaysian-Indonesian department of INALCO, Paris, France, and their status as native French speakers. The said difference in study year is thought to be the main variable affecting the production of phonic interference.

The instruments used in this study are the microphone of a smartphone (Xiaomi POCO M3) alongside a backup laptop (Lenovo Thinkpad E14) microphone which recorded the interviews and test sessions with the subjects. The sessions were done between the 1st and 21st of February 2023 at the

soundproof group room (*salle de groupe*) inside INALCO's library to minimize any interference that could compromise the validity of the study.

This is a qualitative study based on Creswell's (2012) theory analyzing specific set-data towards a general conclusion by examining the forms of interferences occurring in verbal production of Indonesian by the subjects. The qualitative method is employed since it interprets gathered data and correlates them with a more general problem.

The study was done by providing the subjects with 20 Indonesian words containing 10 phonemes placed in the middle of 10 sentences. The subjects then pronounced these sentences to trace the treatment of Indonesian phonemes that do not exist in French. These words were deliberately selected for their phonetic complexity, characterized by features such as multiple phonemes within a single word or paired words exhibiting varied phoneme positions. Notably, the list is not exhaustive as other words with same phonemes exist. For instance, *rokok* contains /r/ and /ʔ/, *cakar* contains /c/ and /r/, *hanggar* contains /h/, /ŋ/ and /r/, *khusus* contains /x/, *jala* contains /ʃ/, *rangkaian* contains /r/, /ŋ/ and /aj/, *kalau* contains /aw/, and *sepoi* contains /oj/. However, the words used for the study are considered the most representative of each phoneme. The details are shown in Table 1 and 2. The list below includes the affected Indonesian phones, target words, and predicted interference.

Table 1. Prediction of phone pronunciation by research subjects

Target phonemes	Target words	Predictions of phone pronunciation
/ʔ/	Bapak /bapaʔ/ Bakso /baʔso/	[k]
/c/	Cicak /cicaʔ/ Cacing /cacin/	[s] atau [k]
/ʃ/	Jajanan /ʃajan/	[ʒ]
	Penjajahan /pənʃajan/	
/x/	Akhir /axir/ Khas /xas/	[k] atau [h]
/h/	Rupiah /rupjah/ Harus /harus/	Not pronounced
/ŋ/	Jangan /ʃajan/	[ng]
	Pengalengan /pənʃalengan/	
/r/	Kurir /kurir/ Pramugari /pramugari/	[R]
/aw/	Harimau /harimaw/ Pulau /pulaw/	[au]
/aj/	Santai /santaj/ Melambai /mələmbaj/	[ai]
/oj/	Koboi /kobɔj/ Boikot /bɔjkɔt/	[oi]

Table 2. Target words based on phonemic differences

Phonemes	Target words	Given sentences
/ʔ/	<i>Bapak, Bakso</i>	<i>Bapak saya makan bakso.</i>
/c/	<i>Cicak, Cacing</i>	<i>Cicak dan cacing adalah binatang.</i>
/ʃ/	<i>Penjajahan, Jajanan</i>	<i>Jajanan ini sudah ada dari zaman penjajahan.</i>
/x/	<i>Khas, Akhir</i>	<i>Yang akhir ini adalah makanan khas.</i>
/h/	<i>Rupiah, Harus</i>	<i>Uang rupiah ini harus ditukar.</i>
/ŋ/	<i>Jangan, Pengalengan</i>	<i>Jangan pergi ke Pengalengan.</i>
/r/	<i>Kurir, Pramugari</i>	<i>Ari adalah kurir, sementara Ara adalah pramugari.</i>
/aj/	<i>Santai, Melambai</i>	<i>Ada banyak harimau di pulau ini.</i>
/aw/	<i>Pulau, Kerbau</i>	<i>Dia sedang bersantai sambil melambai.</i>
/oj/ or /ɔj/	<i>Koboi, Boikot</i>	<i>Para koboi sedang melakukan boikot</i>

To ensure that an error was indeed a consistent mistake, the subjects were asked to pronounce each of the 10 sentences three times, and the most frequently occurring error was identified as the mistake.

Data analysis

The collected data were analyzed to find interference in December 2023. The analysis is based on a functionalist theory that emphasizes the difference in linguistic system between the first and target languages. Apart from the systemic difference, this approach traces various extralinguistic factors that exacerbate or moderate errors in linguistic production, such as perceptual interest, ease of cognitive processing, physical limitations and communicative needs. Error analysis, which is a technique involving an internal focus on the learner's creative ability to construct a language, is used as well in the research. It is based on the description and analysis of real errors, rather than based on the idealized linguistic structure. Related to this model of analysis, there is a differentiation between errors and mistakes. Errors are recurring faults caused by the learner's ignorance of the target language's system, while mistakes are non-recurring faults and are caused by various factors, such as forgetfulness.

The subsequent result is then analyzed using Weinreich's (2010) and Saville-Troike's (2006) theories of interference to highlight the linguistic factors causing the phenomenon. Afterwards, to examine the psychological aspects causing interference, a framework based on the synthesis of Macatuno-Nocom's (2022), Weinreich's (2010) and Saville-Troike's (2006) theories are used. And then, Jafarova's (2021), Weinreich's (2010) and Saville-Troike's (2006) concepts are used to study the socio-cultural aspects affecting interference, while Okeke's (2020) and Saville-Troike's (2006) concepts are used to analyse how phonic interference impacts the effectiveness

of communication. This research places itself within the scope of phonic interference in Indonesian by native French language speakers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

After examining data taken from the pronunciation of Indonesian by three research subjects, several deviations of phone pronunciation are found. These are shown in the following table.

Table 3. Phone pronunciation by research subjects

Target words	Standard pronunciation	Subject A's pronunciation	Subject B's pronunciation	Subject C's pronunciation
Bapak	/bapaʔ/	[bapak]	[bapak]	[bapak]
Bakso	/baʔso/	[bakso]	[bakso]	[bakso]
Cicak	/cicaʔ/	[citʃak]	[tʃitʃak]	[tʃitʃak]
Cacing	/caciŋ/	[katʃiŋ]	[tʃantʃiŋ]	[caciŋ]
Jajanan	/ʃaʃanan/	[ʒaʒanan]	[ʒaʒanan]	[ʃaʒanan]
Penjajahan	/pəŋʃaʃahan/	[penʒaʒa:n]	[penʒaʒahan]	[penʒaʃahan]
Akhir	/axir/	[ahiR]	[ahrir]	[axir]
Khas	/xas/	[kas]	[kas]	[kas]
Rupiah	/rupjah/	[Rupja]	[rupja]	[rupjah]
Harus	/harus/	[aRus]	[harus]	[arus]
Jangan	/ʃaŋan/	[ʒanan]	[ʒaŋgan]	[ʃaŋan]
Pengalengan	/pəŋaləŋan/	[penʒaləŋan]	[pəŋgaləŋgan]	[pəŋgaləŋan]
Kurir	/kurir/	[kuRir]	[kurir]	[kurir]
Pramugari	/pramugari/	[pramugaRi]	[pramugari]	[pramugari]
Harimau	/harimaw/	[arimau]	[harimaru]	[arimau]
Pulau	/pulaw/	[pulaw]	[pulaw]	[pulaw]
Santai	/santaj/	[santaj]	[santaj]	[santaj]
Melambai	/mələmbaj/	[melambaj]	[mələmbaj]	[mələmbaj]
Koboi	/kobɔj/	[kobɔj]	[kobɔj]	[kobɔj]
Boikot	/bɔjkot/	[bɔjkɔt]	[bɔjkɔt]	[bɔjkɔt]

From analysis of pronunciations by the three subjects, several errors in pronunciation and phone realization were found. Subject A made 16 errors out of 20 pronunciations, subject B made 12 errors out of 20 pronunciations, and subject C made nine errors out of 20 pronunciations. Furthermore, out of Weinreich's (2010) categorization of phonic interference, three types were found in the research subjects, namely under-differentiation of phonemes, reinterpretation of distinctions, and phone substitution. The first is

the most frequent type of errors, due to the fact that many consonant phonemes in Indonesian do not exist in French.

Table 4. Errors of phone pronunciation by research subjects

Target phonemes	Subject A's errors	Subject B's errors	Subject C's errors
/ʔ/	[k]	[k]	[k]
/c/	[tʃ] or [k]	[tʃ]	[tʃ]
/ʃ/	[ʒ]	[ʒ]	[ʒ]
/x/	[h] or [k]	[h] or [k]	[k]
/h/	Not pronounced	Not pronounced	Not pronounced
/ŋ/	[n]	[ŋg]	[ŋg]
/r/	[R]	-	-
/e/	-	[ə]	-
/ə/	[e]	-	-
/aw/	[au]	[aru]	[au]
/aj/	-	-	-
/oj/ or /ɔj/	-	-	-

Discussion

The aforementioned errors can be examined based on the concept of phonic interference from Weinreich (2010) that classifies them into three groups.

Under-differentiation of phonemes

This phonic interference is caused by the lack of differentiation of two phonemes in the first language, which are considered two distinct phonemes in the target language.

All three subjects struggled with pronouncing [ʔ] in “bakso” [baʔso] and “bapak” [bapaʔ] as it's not a phoneme in French. Consequently, they reduced the phoneme difference and pronounced it with [k] instead, the closest sound in French. The errors could be due to the subjects observing the pronunciation pattern in Indonesian and hence pronouncing the grapheme “k” with [k]. Both errors are phonetic as they do not change the meaning of the word.

Subjects A and B omitted the phone [x] in “khas” [xas] and “akhir” [axir], while subject C omitted it only in “khas” [xas]. This is because French lacks [x], resulting in subjects using the closest known phones, [k] or [h], depending on the surrounding graphemes. Interestingly, the pronunciation of “akhir” [axir] consistently changes [x] to [h], while “khas” [xas] changes it to [k]. Articulatorily, [k] involves palate contact, while adjacent [a] and

[h] position the tongue lower. This explains the absence of [x] and the use of [k] in “khas” [xas]. There may be an extralinguistic influence as well, as subjects more frequently hear “akhir” [axir] pronounced as [ahir]. Mispronunciation of “akhir” [axir] is phonetic, not altering meaning. However, mispronouncing “khas” [xas] as [kas] changes the meaning to “cash,” making it phonological.

Subjects A and B excluded the [h] sound in “rupiah” [rupjah] and “harus” [harus] from the pronunciation. Subject B managed to pronounce [h] in “harus” [harus], while subject C pronounced [h] in “rupiah” [rupjah]. The absence of /h/ in French explains the omission. Subject B’s failure to pronounce [h] at the end of a word suggests they did not consider it significant and didn’t exert effort. Subject C’s success in pronouncing [h] at the end of “rupiah” but not at the beginning of “harus” [harus] may be due to the articulatory increased effort required at word-initial position. Mispronunciation of “rupiah” [rupjah] is phonetic and doesn’t change meaning. However, mispronouncing “harus” as [arus] changes its meaning to “arus” [arus] (flow), making it phonological.

Subject A mispronounced the phone [ŋ] as [n] in “jangan” [ʃaŋan]. This is due to the absence of [ŋ] in French, except at the ends of English loanwords. Subject A substituted [ŋ] with the closest French phoneme, [n]. This error is phonetic as it doesn’t alter word meaning and is still intelligible.

Reinterpretation of distinctions

Another type of phonic interference, reinterpretation of distinctions, is found in this study. It takes place where one differentiates the phonemes of a target language by employing the language structure of one’s first language.

Subjects B and C mispronounced [ŋ] as [ŋg]. This suggests that they were aware of and capable of pronouncing [ŋ]. The addition of [g] may be due to the absence of [ŋ] followed by a vowel sound in French. Therefore, the subjects added the consonant sound [g], influenced by the presence of [g] in the target words “jangan” [ʃaŋan] and “pengalengan” [pəŋalɛŋan]. This phenomenon can be seen as a reinterpretation attempt by the subjects. Mispronouncing “jangan” [ʃaŋan] as [ʒaŋgan] can be considered a phonological error, as it resembles the pronunciation of “janggan” [ʒaŋgan] and may cause confusion. However, the mispronunciation of “pengalengan” [pəŋalɛŋan] is phonetic, as it doesn’t change the word’s meaning and it remained understandable.

Subject A pronounced “cacing” [cacin] as [katʃin]. This occurred due to the absence of the phone [c] in French. Subject A replaced it with a similar phoneme based on French pronunciation patterns which shows a reinterpretation of distinctions. Similarly, all three subjects often replaced [c] with [tʃ], as [c] is absent in French. They used the closest familiar phone, [tʃ], which is a French phoneme used in words such as “cire” [tʃiʁ]. These errors

are phonetic and do not alter word meaning and it remains understandable.

Subject A mispronounced [ə] as [e] in “pengalengan” [pəŋaləŋan] and “melambai” [mələmbaj]. All three subjects also mispronounced [ə] as [e] in “penjajahan” [pəŋʃajahan]. This error occurred due to unfamiliarity with the target words and articulatory factors. The transition from [e] to the following phoneme is easier than from [ə] in the word “pengalengan” [pəŋaləŋan]. This pattern is observed in the pronunciation of [e] before [ŋa] and [a]. Subject A chose the easiest pronunciation, [e], when unsure between [ə] and [e] in “pengalengan” [pəŋaləŋan]. These errors are phonetic and do not affect word meaning and it remains understandable.

Subject B mispronounced the [e] sound as [ə] in the second “e” grapheme of “pengalengan” [pəŋaləŋan]. This occurred due to unfamiliarity with the word and articulatory factors. Pronouncing [ə] after [al] requires less effort than pronouncing [e]. Subject B chose the easier option, [ə], when unsure of the correct pronunciation. These errors are phonetic and do not affect word meaning and it remains understandable.

Phone substitution

The last type of phonic interference appears in the study is phone substitution. It occurs when two phonemes to are identically defined in both the first and target languages but which normal pronunciation differs.

All three subjects made the mistake of pronouncing the phone [ʃ] as [ʒ] in the words “jajanan” and “penjajahan” [pəŋʃajahan]. This happens due to the absence of the phoneme /ʃ/ in French. Apart from that, in French, the grapheme “j” is often pronounced as [ʒ], so the phone is chosen as a substitute for the phoneme /ʃ/. This is a phonetic error as it does not change the meaning of the word and the word remains understandable.

Subject A made the mistake of pronouncing the phone [r] as [R] in the words “kurir” [kurir] and “pramugari” [pramugari]. This is mainly because in French, the grapheme “r” is often pronounced as [R], so the sound was chosen as a substitute for the phoneme /r/. Additionally, the phenomenon is also caused by the absence of the /r/ phoneme in French. Both errors are phonetic as they do not change the meaning of the words and thus the words remain understandable.

All three subjects mispronounced the word “harimau” [harimaw] as [arimau] (subjects A and C) and [arimaru] (subject B). Subjects A and C substituted [aw] with [au], likely due to the absence of the diphthong [aw] in French. They applied a phoneme substitution based on the phonetic representation of graphemes in Indonesian. Subject B’s mispronunciation may be attributed to the preceding words with [r] sounds during the study, leading to unconscious influence in placing [r] before the last vowel sound. These errors are phonetic, not altering the word meaning and thus the word remains understandable.

The effect of the research subjects’ profiles on pronunciation errors
Learning process aspect

In the pronunciation test, subject A produced 16 errors out of 20 items. Subject B followed with 12 errors, while subject C made nine errors in total.. The number of errors between subjects is different even though all three of them speak French as their mother tongue and have Indonesian as their target language. Accordingly, further analyses of the subjects’ learning process, psychological, and socio-cultural backgrounds are needed to establish the factors that influence these differences in the number of errors. The analysis will start with the subjects’ learning process profiles which can be found in the table below.

Table 5. Research subjects’ learning process profiles

Indicators	Subjects		
	Subject A	Subject B	Subject C
Number of pronunciation errors	16 errors	12 errors	9 errors
Mastered languages	French	French	French
	English	English	Sranan tongo
	Spanish	Spanish	English
	Indonesian	Indonesian	Indonesian
			Dukka
Duration of studying the Indonesian language up until the collection of data	One year	Two years	Three years
Frequency of Indonesian language study	Six hours per week	Nine hours per week	10 hours per week
Methods in studying the Indonesian language	University classes	University classes	University classes
	Language learning app	Indonesian news sites	Indonesian films
		Discussions with native Indonesian speakers	Indonesian podcasts
Frequency of Indonesian language usage	Six hours each week	1,5 hours per week	Six hours each week

Pronunciation errors represent the speaker’s low level of language mastery. Therefore, the less pronunciation errors a person makes, the better their language mastery, and they can be said to have mastered the language. This research shows that the mastery of Indonesian is directly proportional to the duration and frequency of studying Indonesian by the subjects.

The subject’s learning method also has an influence on their pronunciation abilities. The Indonesian learning methods that prioritize oral skills, namely oral comprehension and oral production, lead to better Indonesian pronunciation. In this case, subject C (who made the least number of errors), uses three learning methods that stimulate their oral comprehension. Meanwhile, subject B only has two oral learning methods (university class and discussion), and subject A has only one oral learning method (university class). Language learning applications are not considered an oral method due to the subject stating that the application she uses focuses on writing skills.

Interestingly this study found that the frequency of Indonesian production is not directly proportional to the number of pronunciation errors. Although a subject might use Indonesian more often, it does not mean that they will have more precise pronunciation. However, it should be noted that subject A did most of their production in a formal learning environment, whilst subjects B and C did theirs in an informal environment. This finding also does not negate the possibility that a higher frequency of Indonesian production is directly proportional to other indicators of language proficiency, such as having a broader diction.

Psychological aspect

In mastering a language, it is not only linguistic profiles that have an impact. Psychological aspects too have an influence in the acquisition of a language. The psychological profiles that impacted the subjects’ language abilities are shown in the table below.

Table 6. Research subjects’ psychological profiles

Indicators	Subjects		
	Subject A	Subject B	Subject C
Number of pronunciation errors	16 errors	12 errors	9 errors
Age during the start of study	Adult	Adult	Adult
Sex	Female	Male	Male
Motivation	Integrative	Instrumental	Integrative
Learning strategy	Cognitive	Metacognitive and socio-affective	Metacognitive and socio-affective
Personality based on the Big Five Theory (score)	Neuroticism (82)	Neuroticism (64)	Neuroticism (56)
	Extroversion (66)	Extroversion (96)	Extroversion (77)
	Openness to experience (84)	Openness to experience (96)	Openness to experience (64)
	Agreeableness (80)	Agreeableness (89)	Agreeableness (74)
	Conscientiousness (74)	Conscientiousness (88)	Conscientiousness (100)

In the aspect of age during studies, all subjects fall into the category of adult. In this research, the difference in age does not influence the pronunciation errors made by the research subjects. In the case of the gender aspect, it appears that males in this research have a higher mastery of language than the female. However, it is important to note that this research uses only three subjects, one of whom happened to be female. Therefore, the statement relating to the influence of genders might be inaccurate.

Regarding motivation, subject A started studying Indonesian because she found it interesting. She also stated that their main motivation in learning Indonesian is to gain the ability to read and write Indonesian texts, understand Indonesian songs and to be able to travel in Indonesia. She, therefore, has an integrative motivation. However, due to the proportion of her motivation centred around writing comprehension, this might have lessened the focus in increasing oral comprehension, resulting in imperfect pronunciation when using the language. Subject B finds their main motivation to study Indonesian in their desire to work and travel in Indonesia, which shows that he has instrumental motivation. Even so, there is also a strong integrative aspect in subject B because he too mentioned that being able to read Indonesian text, facilitates a better travel and work experience in Indonesia, and so have become strong motivations in learning the language. Subject C revealed that he learnt Indonesian because he likes the language and because of family, who live in Suriname and have Indonesian origins. This shows zealous integrative motivation within the subject. This motivation to study Indonesian is supported by the desire to make friends with Indonesians, travel in Indonesia, and understand Indonesian film and music. He also has a strong instrumental motivation because he stated the desire to work in Indonesia and have professional relations with Indonesians as things that motivate his learning. Based on those explanations, it can be concluded that the motivation to study has a powerful influence on one's language abilities. Even though subject A has integrative motivation, she tends to make a lot of pronunciation errors because she is more interested in writing and reading-comprehension. Meanwhile, subject B and C both have a strong desire to be competent in oral comprehension and production, though subject C displayed higher mastery of the language due to an inclination towards integrative motivation whereas subject B tended to have instrumental motivation.

In the matter of learning strategies, subject A admits to having done numerous translations throughout their studies and using context to guess the meaning of an unfamiliar word, showing a cognitive learning strategy. However, she did not do a lot of preparation before classroom learning. Unlike subject A, subject B tends to prepare themselves before classroom lessons by doing things such as rereading a text or examining certain vocabulary. He also does a lot of informal oral communication in Indonesian, which shows that subject B practices a metacognitive and socio-affective

learning strategy. Lastly, subject C prepares themselves before lessons by re-reading texts that were previously given as well as measuring the development of their competence in Indonesian. He also practices informal oral Indonesian communication with other Indonesian speakers. By doing so, he practices a metacognitive and socio-affective learning strategy. It can be concluded that the practice of using more learning strategies can increase language abilities. However, metacognitive strategies have an important role in good pronunciation too due to the fact that phonological accuracy requires constant repetition to perfect it.

In respect to the personality aspect, conscientiousness is directly proportional with the language abilities of a subject, meanwhile neuroticism is inversely proportional. Subject A has the highest neuroticism and lowest conscientiousness. Therefore, it can be assumed that she experiences a lot of negative emotion and has the lowest discipline when compared to the other subjects. This can cause a subject to be less competent than other subjects in controlling their Indonesian pronunciation. Meanwhile, contrary to popular belief, a high social competence (represented by extraversion, openness, and agreeableness) does not guarantee correct pronunciation in the target language. Although subject B has the highest social competence of the three subjects, he still made more pronunciation errors than subject C (who has the lowest level of social competence). It needs to be said that this doesn't erase the possibility that someone with a high level of social competence could have a higher competence in other fields of linguistics, such as a broad lexical knowledge and high social competence might also increase the inputs and feedback that the student receives which could in turn increase their language abilities.

Socio-cultural aspect

The last aspect that influences one's language skills is the socio-cultural aspect which comprises: (1) limits, (2) identity, (3) social category, (4) learning environment, and (5) input and feedback (Saville-Troike, 2006). The research subjects' profiles can be found in the table below.

Table 7. Research subjects’ socio-cultural profiles

Indicators	Subjects		
	Subject A	Subject B	Subject C
Number of pronunciation errors	16 errors	12 errors	9 errors
Limitations	No limitations	No limitations	No limitations
Identity	Muslim	No specific identity	Indonesian origin
Social category	First year student	Second year student	Third year student
Learning environment	Conducive	Conducive	Conducive
Duration of living in Indonesia	Never	Five months	Never
Input and feedback	Low	High	High

Most of the subjects’ socio-cultural indicators show that there are no differences between them. This shows an egalitarian condition in their Indonesian learning environment. They mentioned that they did not find any limitations in learning Indonesian. The same can be said for their learning environment which they all stated to be conducive. Their lecturer, specifically, encouraged their language learning by not punishing them when they made mistakes. In addition to that, they received Indonesian oral production lessons from a native Indonesian speaker, a factor that increases the conductivity of their learning environment, which also includes the duration of living in Indonesia. Subject B is the only one to have lived in Indonesia for a significant duration (five months). Despite this, it does not mean that they automatically have a higher mastery of the language, which is proven by the fact that subject B still made more pronunciation errors than subject C. Moreover, subject B stated that he lived in Indonesia approximately 30 years ago, long before he began studying Indonesian formally, but which nonetheless suggests that living in a society that mainly uses the target language would not necessarily increase one’s ability to use the target language.

Furthermore, there are several other aspects in which all the subjects have differences. Subject A, for example, is Muslim and admitted that one of the reasons that pushed them to learn Indonesian is the fact that Indonesia is a country where a majority of its inhabitants are Muslim. On the other hand, subject C has Indonesian roots and said that this fact is one of their motivations in learning Indonesian. Nonetheless, this research shows that the factor of identity has a limited function in motivating the subjects in learning Indonesian and that it does not directly increase their abilities in the language. Further, this study found that the social category, which can include several features such as economic or racial background, did not significantly inhibit the subjects’ chances to study since all three subjects did

not declare any obstacles in learning the Indonesian language other than those related to personality. There was only one social category, the difference in their year at INALCO studying Indonesian, which appears directly proportional to their mastery of the language. Finally, the factor of input and feedback appears directly proportional to their language skills. This is related to their learning strategies where subject B and C who used the socio-affective learning strategy tended to receive higher input and feedback and thus achieved better mastery of the Indonesian language, specifically in the oral aspect.

The Influence of extralinguistic aspects in pronunciation errors

This study concluded that linguistic aspects, especially the duration of study, plays the most important part in developing one's language skills (here represented specifically by the pronunciation abilities of the subjects). In respect to the psychological aspect, motivation and personality also proved to have a principal role of which discipline was found to be the most essential feature of personality in achieving correct pronunciation. Meanwhile, the subjects had socio-cultural backgrounds that were more or less similar which shows that in this case the socio-cultural profiles of the subjects did not play a key role in the accuracy of their pronunciation.

In respect to communication, this research found that phonic interference does not hinder the effectiveness of communication. In the impromptu conversations with the three test subjects, the phonological interference that occurred did not hamper comprehension and understanding within the discussion. The messages were conveyed properly by the test subjects to the interlocutor without the need to use non-verbal communication as an additional aid. Furthermore, out of the 23 forms of mistakes made by the subjects, 86% were phonetic errors and did not change the meaning of the word, thus not affecting the effectiveness of communication. Additionally, in 14% of the cases where errors were phonological, context might have helped the interlocutor in understanding what the speaker meant to say despite the errors, which again proves that phonological interference doesn't impede effective communication. Okeke (2020) states that phonological interference hinders communication, but in numerous cases this study finds that failure in communication is actually a result of low-competence in communication, where competence is defined as all knowledge a speaker needs to know in order to communicate well in a certain community (Saville-Troike, 2006).

CONCLUSION

The results of this research show that a French native speaker has trouble in pronouncing the Indonesian phonemes /ʔ/ /c/, /ʃ/, /x/, /h/, /ŋ/, /r/, and diphthong /aw/. This difficulty results in an error which manifests in several forms by way of reduction of phoneme difference, reinterpretation of relevant features, and phoneme substitution. This supports the findings of Lestari (2021) which state three phones in the Indonesian language, [r], [h], and [ŋ], that are likely to cause interference to speakers with French as their mother tongue.

Based on the results of this research and the analysis of interference in the Indonesian language expressed by speakers with French as their mother tongue, it can be concluded that the learning process aspect, specifically the duration of study, plays the key role in one's language abilities (in this research represented by the ability to correctly pronounce certain words). However, extralinguistic factors, which are often unaccounted for in interference research, play a significant role in one's mastery of a foreign language too. In respect to the linguistic aspect, most of the interference occurring was caused by a nonexistence of Indonesian phonemes in French or the rare usage of certain phones, as is the case with the phones [h], [ŋ], or [r], though the introduction and familiarity of a phoneme is a notable dimension here. If one knows the existence, or nonexistence, of a certain phoneme in the target language, then the potential of interference decreases. Despite these factors, however, as previously mentioned, the duration of study remains the most important aspect in one's mastery of a language.

With respect to extralingual factors, which consist of psychological and socio-cultural aspects, the psychological aspect involving motivation and learning strategy has the highest importance, while personality plays a secondary role. Integrative motivation or the motivation that entails a higher desire to become a part of the target language native speakers' society results in better language mastery compared to instrumental motivation or the motivation that stems from external factors, such as the desire to work in a country that mainly uses the target language. In respect to learning methods, the implementation of several forms of learning strategies can quicken language mastery compared to using just one. Additionally, in respect to personality, conscientiousness tends to be directly proportional with one's language abilities, while neuroticism is inversely proportional to it. Further, high social competence (represented by extraversion, openness, and agreeableness) can also increase the mastery of a language because it can increase the chance of input and feedback received by a learner. These factors are important because the socio-cultural aspect of input and feedback play a key role and are directly proportional to a person's language abilities. To the contrary, however, identity did not have a significant influence in language mastery. The analysis also shows that phonic interference has little impact on the effectiveness of communication with only 14% of

pronunciation errors made by the subjects being phonological in nature that changed the meaning of a word, while the majority, or 86% were phonetic errors.

Examination of previous studies reveal several suggestions that suppress phonic interference. Several specialized methods, such as learning model techniques based on intercultural local politeness learning models (ILPLM) integrating culture (Gusnawaty & Nurwati, 2019), and mobile assisted language learning (MALL) (Sun & Gao, 2019) are proven to advance learners' proficiency and suppress interference. Additionally, several educator characteristics were found to be important in increasing the learner's language abilities, which were: (1) passion for their job, (2) adjusting their lessons in accordance to the general learners' objective in language learning, (3) being appreciative towards learners, and (4) teaching social competence from the target language (Saito et al., 2018; Saville-Troike, 2006; Seven, 2020). Lastly, repetition of difficult phones for learners (which are [ʔ], [c], [ɟ], [x], [h], [ŋ], [r], and [aw] according to this research) and the use of *virelangue* can directly target phonic interference and greatly reduce their influence based on studies by Dewa & Laksman-Huntley (2022), Wiratsih (2019) and Lestari (2021). This study focuses on the learners' perspective with respect to language learning. However, the process of language learning involves two stakeholders, the learners, and the teacher. Therefore, further studies to examine the teacher's role and influence in the success of language learning is particularly encouraged.

This article is a qualitative work that examines how one's profile could influence the production of language. Therefore, the data used in this research is limited and thus could create imperfect results. Hence, this research can be quantitatively further investigated to find the significance of mispronunciation by subjects using several methods like the T test or the chi square.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Rizki Ramdhani for his valuable contributions to the data collection process of this research. We also gratefully acknowledge the support of the Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales (INALCO) for providing facilities during the writing of this research.

REFERENCES

- Adityarini, I. A. P., Pastika, I. W., & Sedeng, I. N. (2020). Interferensi fonologi pada pembelajar BIPA asal Eropa di Bali. *Aksara*, 32(1). <https://doi.org/10.29255/aksara.v32i1.409.167-186>
- Al-Hoorie, A. H., & Macintyre, P. D. (Eds.) (2019). *Contemporary language motivation theory: 60 years since Gardner and Lambert (1959)*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/AL-HOOR5198>
- Capliez, M. (2016). *Acquisition and learning of English phonology by French speakers: on the roles of segments and suprasegmentals* [Doctorate's thesis]. Université Lille III
- Chaer, A. (2009). *Fonologi bahasa Indonesia*. PT Rineka Cipta

- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. In *Educational Research* (Vol. 4)
- Dewa, A. N., & Laksman-Huntley, M. (2022). Strategies to develop French pronunciation using virelangu. *Diksi*, 30(2). <https://doi.org/10.21831/diksi.v30i2.46770>
- Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2019). *Ethnologue: languages of the world*. Twenty-second edition. SIL International
- Gallix, A. (2013). French protects their language like the British protect their currency. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/may/23/language-french-identity>
- Grehenson, G. (2022). Penutur bahasa Indonesia capai 300 juta jiwa. *Universitas Gadjah Mada*. <https://ugm.ac.id/id/berita/22527-penutur-bahasa-indonesia-capai-300-juta-jiwa/>
- Gusnawaty, G., & Nurwati, A. (2019). A Learning model of Bahasa Indonesia as a foreign language based on local intercultural politeness. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 38(1). <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v38i1.23164>
- Jafarova, K. A. (2021). The Role of extralinguistic factors in interlingual relations and theoretical issues of interference. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.21744/ling-cure.v5n1.415>
- Lantika, D., & Cholsy, H. (2023). Interferensi fonologi pemelajar BIPA dengan bahasa pertama bahasa Prancis dalam pelafalan kosakata bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing*, 5(1), 12–22
- Léon, P. R. (1992). *Phonétisme et prononciations du français avec des travaux pratiques d'application et leurs corrigés*. Nathan.
- Lestari, D. (2021). Penerapan fonetik artikulatoris dalam pembelajaran BIPA di Prancis. *Semnalisa*
- Macatuno-Nocom, N. (2022). Motivation and learning strategies on foreign language acquisition. *South Florida Journal of Development*, 3(2), 2885–2896. <https://doi.org/10.46932/sfjdv3n2-102>
- Meidi, A. A., & Laksman-Huntley, M. (2020). Interferensi bahasa ibu dalam pengucapan vokal Prancis. *International University Symposium on Humanities and Arts (INUSHARTS 2020)*, 19–33
- Meziane, R. S., & MacLeod, A. A. N. (2021). Evidence of phonological transfer in bilingual pre-schoolers who speak Arabic and French. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 25(6). <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069211034232>
- Nasaruddin, N. (2017). Interferensi fonetis Bahasa Arab dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Analisis ujaran bahasa Indonesia oleh penutur Arab. *Adabiyyāt: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.14421/ajbs.2017.01204>
- Nwode, G. C., Azubuike, U. P., & Egwu, R. O. U. (2022). Mother-tongue interference and clashing phonetic and phonological manifestations in speeches of Ehugbo Non-Native speakers of English. *EBSU Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 12(1), 66–72
- Okeke, F. (2020). Language and communication: Attaining communicative competence by participants. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3565137>
- Rafael, A. M. D. (2019). Interferensi fonologis penutur bahasa Melayu Kupang ke dalam bahasa Indonesia di kota Kupang. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.23917/humaniora.v20i1.7225>
- Rohali. (2018). The Phonetic interference: Indonesian into French. *4th International Symposium on Language and Arts Education, Kelantan, Malaysia*, 1–13
- Ruskin, A. (2016). *How multilinguals perceive linguistic interference* [Master's thesis]. Minnesota State University
- Saito, K., Dewaele, J. M., Abe, M., & In'nami, Y. (2018). Motivation, emotion, learning experience, and second language comprehensibility development in classroom settings: A Cross-sectional and longitudinal study. *Language Learning*, 68(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12297>
- Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, J. R., Hartsuiker, R. J., & De Houwer, J. (2018). Interference in Dutch–French bilinguals: stimulus and response conflict in intra- and interlingual stroop. *Experimental Psychology*, 65(1). <https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169/a000384>
- Seven, M. A. (2020). Motivation in language learning and teaching. *African Educational Research Journal*, 8(2), 62–71. <https://doi.org/10.30918/AERJ.8S2.20.033>
- Straka, G. (1965). Contribution à l'histoire de la consonne R en français. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 66(4), 572–606

- Taqiyya, M. K., & Widayanti, D. V. (2021). L'analyse des erreurs de la prononciation des apprenants de langue française aux examens Delf A1 et A2 dans 6 pays. *Didactofrancia: Journal Didactique Du FLE*, 10(1), 49–62. <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/dicdac>
- Teimouri, Y., Plonsky, L., & Tabandeh, F. (2022). L2 grit: Passion and perseverance for second-language learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(5). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820921895>
- Telkom University. (2024). Pelaksanaan kelas BIPA KBRI Paris semester 2 tahun 2024. *Telkom University*. <https://lac.telkomuniversity.ac.id/pelaksanaan-kelas-bipa-kbri-paris-semester-2-tahun-2024/>
- Weinreich, U. (2010). *Languages in contact*. Mouton
- Wiratsih, W. (2019). Analisis kesulitan pelafalan konsonan bahasa Indonesia (Studi kasus terhadap pemelajar BIPA asal Tiongkok di Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta). *KREDO: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra*, 2(2), 242–255. <https://doi.org/10.24176/kredo.v2i2.3061>