Check for updates

Phonological Interference in English Pronunciation Produced by Students at Senior High School (A Case Study of Buginese and Javanese Students)

Nirwana¹, Suhono²*
¹Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Alaudin Makassar, Indonesia
²Institut Agama Islam Ma'arif NU (IAIMNU) Metro Lampung, Indonesia

✉ suhono120708@gmail.com*

Abstract

This research discussed the Buginese and Javanese phonological interference and the factors that influenced that case from the students in senior high school. The method that was used in this research was qualitative research. The researchers collected the data with nine fricative consonants (f, v, θ, ð, s, z, ʃ, ʒ, h) by reading test, recording and interview, then analyzed with the theory by Weinreich (1979). The object was the Buginese and Javanese students of Senior High School 2 of East Luwu. The data showed that phonological interference produced by Buginese and Javanese are only two of three kinds of phonological interference by Crystal (2003). From Buginese students, the researchers only found one category of phonological interference which was sound replacements on consonant {f}, meanwhile on Javanese students found two categories of phonological interference, that were sound addition on sound {h} and sound replacement on sound {ʃ}. On the other hand, there are two factors that caused phonological interference of Buginese and Javanese students in this research, such as bilingual background and disloyalty to the target language. The factors that were found related to the factors mentioned by Weinreich (1979).

Keywords: Phonological Interference, Buginese Phonological Interference, Javanese Phonological Interference

INTRODUCTION

Humans are born as social creatures with different cultural backgrounds. This cultural difference will affect all aspects of human life, including language. During the language learning process, humans are greatly influenced by the environment and their mother tongue (Putra, 2022; Prochnow, A., et al., 2019; Mnasri, S., & Habbash, M. 2021; Ganuza, N., & Hedman, C. 2015), and that is what already happens with language learner in Indonesia (Saddhono, K., & Rohmadi, M. 2014).

Indonesia is a country which is known as its unique cultural diversity. Even this uniqueness is one of the attractions for tourists from all over the world. One of the most unique of this diversity is the variety of languages (Le, T. A., et al., 2016; Gumilar, T. 2016). The most prominent feature is the way of speaking, which created a regional language with a total of 742 languages (Samingan, 2020; Farisiyah, U., & Zamzani, Z. 2018; Ambarita, E. 2021). This regional language is spread in various islands and provinces throughout Indonesia. Differences in regional languages will also affect the way a speaker speaks in foreign languages (Harya, 2022; Haryati et al., 2021). Human was born with different languages. To understand each other, we need to have the same language, and

English is one of the solutions to that problem, especially through the international forum (McKenzie, Bull, & Gray, 2003; Kirkpatrick, A. 2012). The language learner has to understand English very well. So that, they need to learn English as soon as possible even since joined compulsory education.

Generally, compulsory education in Indonesia is divided into 3 levels. This level consists of elementary school (6 years), junior high school (3 years), and senior high school (3 years). English itself is included as a subject at the junior and senior high school levels, while for the elementary school it has been eliminated since 2013 based on the 13th curriculum. This makes parents look for other alternatives to teach English from an early age, given the importance of English in this modernization era.

In this learning process, various accents and pronunciations are adapted to the language culture of the country, like what the researchers realized with her environment in Senior High School 2 East Luwu. Adolescents there have a limited social scope in Junior High School. This is because people with similar cultural backgrounds tend to congregate in neighborhoods there. As (Muhyidin, 2016) result on his journal which mentioned that diversities such as cultural diversity, family background, religion, and ethnicity tend to interact with each other in their own communities. So that when they enter the wider social sphere in Senior High School, language disorders in each culture are felt, two of them are Buginese and Javanese.

East Luwu Regency is a new district in South Sulawesi where live Buginese and Javanese a lot. This district consists of 11 districts, one of which is the Wotu district. Wotu sub-district itself consists of 16 villages with a population of more than 30 thousand people consisting of indigenous people and migrants from various regions (source; Luwu Timur district portal). However, with the area and population, Wotu District only has one State Senior High School, namely senior high school 2 East Luwu. This makes the school the main choice after graduating from junior high school.

In recent years, there have been many researchers which talking about phonological interference such as (Masulah, 2017). However, the focus of this research is to compared phonological interference of Buginese and Javanese students in senior high school. In this case, the researchers choose to examine the phonological interference which is influenced by the local language (mother tongue). Through the research processes the data will analyze base on the theory that proposed by Weinreich (1979). Interference divided into three, they are phonological, grammatical, and lexical, but this research focused on phonological interference. Weinreich (1979) states that phonological interference occurs when in the process of speaking a second language, the resulting phonemes tends to be adjusted to the phonetic rules of the first language system.

Therefore, the objects of this research are the students of senior high school 2 East Luwu. The researchers took 32 of them from both cultures. This research also focused on certain English sounds, it is fricative sounds, such f, v, θ, ð, s, z, ʃ, ʒ.

METHODS

The researchers used a qualitative method. According to Cresswell (2017) "Qualitative research is defined as an investigative process to understand a social or human problem, based on constructing a complex, holistic, worded picture, reporting detailed views of the informant, and conducted in a natural setting." This study aimed to see how the local language (mother tongue) influences the phonetic pronunciation of English words in high school, especially in senior high school 2 East Luwu. To get a complete picture and source of this research using qualitative methods.

2

Population and Sample

The researchers chose students in senior high school 2 East Luwu which consists of about 380 students and took 20 students from Buginese and Javanese who are actively in ECC (English Conversation Club) as a sample to get the accurate data. All of the data above come from the teacher in Senior High School 2 East Luwu.

Instrument of the Research

In collecting the data for this research, the researchers used some instruments below:
1. Recording

    The recording was used to record the students during the process of collecting the data from the participants by using the audio-visual recorder device to avoid the loss of data needed, the researchers recorded the process which constituted a scientific record of the experience for future reference.
2. Reading test

    Reading tests which consist of English text from "purwantowahyudi.com and engoo.id" which has an audio of the native speaker.
3. Interview

    The interview aimed to find out more information about students' dialects from both cultures (Bugis and Javanese) and aimed to find out the factors that the students' problems in their own Buginese and Javanese language with their English-speaking skills.

Procedure of Data Collection

In collecting the data for this research, the researchers followed the steps below:
1. The researchers prepared the instrument of the research, such as; recording, interview sheet, and reading test;
2. The researchers recorded the students several time when they read the reading test and during the interview;
3. The researchers identified the phonological interference produced by senior high school's students;
4. The researchers classified the phonological interference produced by senior high school's students and also classified the comparison of Buginese and Javanese phonological interference;

Technique of Analyzing Data

In analyzing the data, the researchers focused on the differences of the phonological interference produced by the students and using Weinreich's theory. Weinreich (1979) considers that phonological interference occurs when in the process of speaking a second language, the resulting phonemes tend to be adjusted to the phonetic rules of the first language system. Weinreich in his book Language in Contact stated that there are several factors that contribute to interference. These are the speaker's bilingualism, disloyalty to the target language, the limited vocabularies of target language mastered by a learner, and prestige and style.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Phonological interference produced by Buginese and Javanese students.

The researchers using 14 text that consist 9 consonants fricative sound which are; /f/, /v/, /θ/, /ð/, /s/, /z/, /ʃ/, /ʒ/, and /h/ to identified the phonological interference which produced by Buginese and Javanese students. After identifying the data, the researchers found that Buginese students produced phonological interference in consonants fricative sounds /f/, /v/, /θ/, /ð/, /z/, and /ʒ/.

3

Table 1. Buginese Phonological Interference

Consonant	Datum	Word	Utterance	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S17	S23	S24
{f}	D1	Laughing: /ˈlɑːfɪŋ/	Laughing: /ˈlɑːγɪŋ/								√		
	D2	If: /ɪf/	If: /ɪv/									√	
	D3	If: /ɪf/	If: /ɪv/										√
{v}	D4	Favorite: /ˈfeɪvərɪt/	Favorite: /ˈfefərɪt/	√									
	D5	Movie: /ˈmuːvi/	Movie: /ˈmufi/	√									
	D6	Have: /hæv/	Have: /hæf/		√								
	D7	Activities: /ækˈtɪvɪtiz/	Activities: /ekˈtɪfɪtis/		√								
	D8	Every: /ˈevri/	Every: /ˈefri/			√							
	D9	Everyone: /ˈevrɪwʌn/	Everyone: /ˈefrɪwʌn/				√						
	D10	Believe: /bɪˈliːv/	Believe: /bəˈlif/					√					
	D11	Movie: /ˈmuːvi/	Movie: /ˈmufi/						√				
	D12	Favorite: /ˈfeɪvərɪt/	Favorite: /ˈfefərɪt/							√			
	D13	Have: /hæv/	Have: /hæf/								√		
{θ}	D14	Trough: /θruː/	Trough: /thru:/	√									
	D15	Thank: /θæŋk/	Thank: /thæŋk/		√								
	D16	Thanks: /θæŋks/	Thanks: /Thæŋks/			√							
	D17	Thanks: /θæŋks/	Thanks: /Thæŋks/					√					
	D18	Think: /θɪŋk/	Think: /chɪŋk/							√			
	D19	Thanks: /θæŋks/	Thanks: /Thæŋks/								√		
	D20	Thanks: /θæŋks/	Thanks: /Thæŋks/									√	
	D21	Think: /θɪŋk/	Think: /tɪŋk/								√		
{ð}	D22	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/	√									
	D23	This: /ðɪːz/	This: /dɪs/		√								
	D24	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/			√							
Consonant	Datum	Word	Utterance	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S17	S23	S24
{ð}	D25	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/				√						
	D26	Weather: /ˈweðə/	Weather: /ˈwedər/					√					
	D27	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/						√				
	D28	There: /ðeər/	There: /der/							√			
	D29	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/								√		
	D30	They: /ðeɪ/	They: /deɪ/								√		
	D31	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/										√
{z}	D32	Is: /ɪz/	Is: /ɪs/	√									
	D33	This: /ðɪːz/	This: /dɪs/		√								
	D34	Was: /wɒz/	Was: /wəs/			√							
	D35	Exactly: /ɪɡˈzæktli/	Exactly: /eksli/					√					
	D36	Was: /wɒz/	Was: /wɒs/					√					
	D37	Sound: /saʊndz/	Sounds: /saʊnds/						√				
	D38	Is: /ɪz/	Is: /ɪs/							√			
	D39	Hobis: /ˈhɒbiz/	Hobis: /ˈhɒbis/								√		
	D40	Is: /ɪz/	Is: /ɪs/								√		
{ʒ}	D41	Treasure: /ˈtreʒəz/	Treasure: /ˈtræʃə(r)/	√									
	D42	Gernres: /ˈ(d)ʒɑːnrəz/	Gernres: /ˈʤeːnrəs/		√								
	D43	Usually: /ˈjuːʒəli/	Usually: /ˈjuːʃəli/			√							
	D44	Vision: /ˈvɪʒən/	Vision: /ˈfɪʃɪʊn/					√					
	D45	Invasion: /ɪnˈveʒən/	Invasion: /ɪnˈfeʃən/				√						
	D46	Usually: /ˈjuːʒəli/	Usually: /ˈjuːʃəli/							√			
	D47	Casual: /ˈkæʒjʊəl/	Casual: /ˈkæʃjʊəl/								√		
	D48	Casual: /ˈkæʒjʊəl/	Casual: /ˈkæʃjʊəl/								√		
	D49	Occasion: /ˈkæʒjʊəl/	Occasion: /əˈkeʃən/										√

4

Table 2. Javanese Phonological Interference

Consonant	Datum	Word	Utterance	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S18	S19	S20
{v}	D50	Movie: /ˈmuːvi/	Movie: /ˈmuːfi/	√									
	D51	Favorite: /ˈfeɪvərɪt/	Favorite: /ˈfafɔrɪt/		√								
	D52	Movie: /ˈmuːvi/	Movie: /ˈmuːfi/			√							
	D53	Of: /ɒv/	Of: /ɒf/				√						
	D54	Movie: /ˈmuːvi/	Movie: /ˈmufi/				√						
	D55	You've: /juːv/	You've: /juːf/				√						
	D56	Favorite: /ˈfeɪvərɪt/	Favorite: /ˈfefɔrɪt/				√						
	D57	Favorite: /ˈfeɪvərɪt/	Favorite: /ˈfefɔrɪt/					√					
	D58	Movie: /ˈmuːvi/	Movie: /ˈmuːfi/					√					
	D59	Have: /hæv/	Have: /hæf/						√				
	D60	Movie: /ˈmuːvi/	Movie: /ˈmuːfi/							√			
	D61	Believe: /bɪˈliːv/	Believe: /bəˈliːf/										
{θ}	D62	Through: /θruː/	Through: /truː/	√									
	D63	Through: /θruː/	Through: /thruː/		√								
	D64	Think: /θɪŋk/	Think: /thɪŋk/			√							
	D65	Thank: /θæŋk/	Thank: /thæŋk/				√						
	D66	Theaters: /ˈθɪətəz/	Theaters: /ˈtɪətərs/				√						
Consonant	Datum	Word	Utterance	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S18	S19	S20
{θ}	D67	Think: /θɪŋk/	Think: /thɪŋ/						√				
	D68	Through: /θruː/	Through: /truː/							√			
	D69	Thank: /θæŋk/	Thank: /thæŋk/								√		
	D70	Thing: /θɪŋ/	Thing: /thɪŋ/									√	
	D71	Thank: /θæŋk/	Thank: /thæŋk/										√
{ð}	D72	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/	√									
	D73	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/		√								
	D74	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/			√							
	D75	This: /ðiːz/	This: /diːs/				√						
	D76	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/					√					
	D77	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/						√				
	D78	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/							√			
	D79	That: /ðæt/	That: /dæt/								√		
	D80	Weather: /ˈwɛðər/	Weather: /ˈwɛdər/								√		
	D81	There: /ðeər/	There: /der/									√	
	D82	This: /ðiːs/	This: /diːs/										√
{z}	D83	Is: /ɪz/	Is: /ɪs/	√									
	D84	Was: /wɒz/	Was: /wɒs/		√								
	D85	Is: /ɪz/	Is: /ɪs/			√							
	D86	This: /ðiːz/	This: /diːs/				√						
	D87	Shoes: /ʃuːz/	Shoes: /ʃuːs/				√						
	D88	Theaters: /ˈθɪətəz/	Theaters: /ˈtɪətərs/					√					
	D89	Is: /ɪz/	Is: /ɪs/						√				
	D90	Was: /wɒz/	Was: /wɒs/							√			
	D91	Is: /ɪz/	Is: /ɪs/								√		
	D92	Hobis: /ˈhɒbiz/	Hobis: /ˈhɒbis/									√	
Consonant	Datum	Word	Utterance	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S18	S19	S20
{z}	D93	Shoes: /ʃuːz/	Shoes: /ʃuːs/										√
{ʃ}	D94	Wish: /wɪʃ/	Wish: /wɪs/			√							
	D95	Wish: /wɪʃ/	Wish: /wɪs/						√				
	D96	Wish: /wɪʃ/	Wish: /wɪs/								√		
{ʒ}	D97	Usually: /ˈjuːʒuəli/	Usually: /ˈjuːsəli/	√									
	D98	Pleasure: /ˈplɛʒə/	Pleasure: /ˈplɛʃə(r)/		√								
	D99	Casual: /ˈkæʒjuəl/	Casual: /ˈkæsʊal/			√							
	D100	Vision: /ˈvɪʒən/	Vision: /ˈfɪʃən/				√						
	D101	Casual: /ˈkæʒjuəl/	Casual: /ˈkæfjuəl/					√					
	D102	Usually: /ˈjuːʒuəli/	Usually: /ˈjuːsuəli/						√				
	D103	Measure: /ˈmɛʒəz/	Measure: /ˈmɛʃərs/							√			
	D104	Invasion: /ɪnˈveɪʒən/	Invasion: /ɪnfeɪʃən/								√		
	D105	Measuring: /ˈmɛʒərɪŋ/	Measuring: /ˈmɛsərɪŋ/									√	
	D106	Usually: /ˈjuːʒuəli/	Usually: /ˈjuːsəli/										√

5

Table 3 The Comparison between Buginese and Javanese Phonological Interference

Students	Cultures	Addition	Omission	Replacement
S8	Buginese			{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S9				{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S10				{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S11				{v}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S12				{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S13				{v}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S14				{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S17				{f}, {v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S23				{f}, {θ}, {ð}
S24				{f}, {ð}, {ʒ}
S1	Javanese	{h}		{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S2				{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S3		{h}		{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʃ}, {ʒ}
S4				{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S5				{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S6				{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʃ}, {ʒ}
S7				{v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S18				{θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}
S19				{θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʃ}, {ʒ}
S20				{θ}, {ð}, {z}, {ʒ}

The data above shows the phonological interference produced by Bugis and Javanese students at Senior High School 2 East Luwu. The researchers used 14 texts containing 9 subject consonants in collecting data, namely {f}, {v}, {θ}, {ð}, {s}, {z}, {ʃ}, {ʒ} , and {h}. From the analysis conducted, the researchers found 108 data which were divided into 49 data from Bugis and 59 data from Java.

Basically the students of Senior High School 2 East Luwu from the two cultures have similarities in mispronouncing {v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, and {ʒ}, but the researchers found significant differences that could be used as a comparison between the two cultures. There are 3 fricative consonants that are {f}, {ʃ}, and {h}. Bugis students found phononological interference on fricative sound {f} while Javanese students found phonological interference on fricative sound {ʃ} and {h}.

The researchers found 3 data from Buginese students that were sound replacements phonological interference in pronouncing sound {f} in word **laughing** found in datum 1 and word **if** in data 2 and 3. Meanwhile, for Javanese students, the researchers found 6 data on the sound, {ʃ} , and {h}. The 5 data are divided into 3 data which contained sound replacement phonological interference in sound {ʃ} in word **wish** in data 95, 96, and 97. Then, the rest 2 data are sound addition phonological interference which contains 2 data in word **honestly** which can be found in data 107 and 108

Factor that caused phonological interference in senior high school students when they speak English

The interview below was the result of 10 students from Buginese and Javanese students of Senior High School 2 East Luwu. The researchers found that there are 4 consonants fricative sound that can be compared from the students phonological interference, so the researchers decide to interview the students who make phonological interference of those 4 consonants fricative sound. Those were 4 students from Buginese and 6 students from Javanese. The 4 students from Buginese, they are 3 students who produce phonological interference in sound replacement {f} and 1 student who produce phonological interference in consonants {v}, {θ}, {ð}, {z}, and {ʒ}. Then, 6 students from Javanese, they are 1 student who produce sound replacement phonological interference in consonant {s}, 3 students who produce

6

sound replacement phonological interference in consonant {ʃ}, and 2 students who produce sound addition phonological interference in consonant {h}.

Table 4

Respondent	Question	Answer
S1/J	What do you think the reason why you make an interference in word "honestly" and is there a silent "h" in Javanese as well as the word honestly?	I think haruska bilangki "h" nya miss. Ndak ku tau bilang tidak pake "h" pale. Kalau in Javanese if awalan "h" we still say "h" nya but different when huruf "h" in the middle. We usually say it with "de", like "adhem or gedhe". **D109**
S2/J	What do you think the reason why you make an interference in words "favorite, through, that, is, and pleasure"?	Because in English tulisannya sama cara bacanya different. So, I say it like, kayak tulisannya ji. **D110**
S3/J	What do you think the reason why you make an interference in words "wish and honestly" and is there a silent "h" in Javanese as well as the word honestly?	Because I don't know miss. Sama ji kayak Ica miss. Kusebutkan seperti tulisannya karna ndak ku tau. Kalau Bahasa Jawa no silent "h" diawal miss middle ji ada. **D111**
S6/J	What do you think the reason why you make an interference in word "wish" and is there a word in Javanese that pronounce different from the way it written?	I am not (apa Bahasa inggrisnya terbiasa miss?) used to bilang "sya" (ʃ) miss. Ada miss but kalau huruf "s" ndak ada. **D112**
S8/B	What do you think the reason why you make an interference in words "favorite, movie, trough, that, and treasure"?	For favorite I can't, maksudku ndak biasaka kasi bergetarki kak, di Bahasa bugis tidak ada bergetar begitu and Indonesia juga contohnya "TV" ku baca "tipi" ji. Begitu ji juga word "bagaimana bacanya ini miss? (asking the pronounciation) iye masi susah disebut. **D113**
S17/B	What do you think the reason why you make an interference in word "laughing" and is there a word in Buginese which use f in it?	I think it should be say with {v} because nothing huruf 'f' in word "laughing" so I think harus with {v} and not {f}. No deh miss. Soppeng ji itu ada miss. But Sidrap I think no. **D114**
S19/J	What do you think the reason why you make an interference in word "wish" and is there a word in Javanese that pronounce different from the way it written?	It's tiba-tiba kak out from my mouth when I read, ku tauki bilang wish pake "sya" tapi begitumi. Kurang terbiasa ka kayaknya deh kak, I need practice more. Kalau word begitu there some but not huruf "s". **D115**
S22/B	What do you think the	Because in English beda tulisan beda

	reason why you make an interference in words "favorite, thanks, weather, supposed, and treasure"?	caranya di sebut. So, I say like tulisannya if I don't know word nya miss. **D116**
S23/B	What do you think the reason why you make an interference in word if, thanks, and they?	It's.., tiba-tiba ji miss. I try like, seperti bule but hard. It's hard to move on from Bahasa Bugis yang there's not {ð} and {θ}. **D117**
S24/B	What do you think the reason why you make an interference in word if, that, occasion?	I think I make a mistake, because I know kalau pake {f}, I think because I try read fast and if you can see di teksnya "I would love it if it wasn't" I try fast but habis bilang "love" jadi salah ka pas di word "if" and for the other word tidak ada huruf begitu in Indonesia apalagi Bugis miss so tidak terbiasaka. **D118**

DISCUSSION

Uriel Weinrich (1970) in his book under the tittle 'Language and Contact; Finding & Discussion', has explained about interference, especially about phonological interference. Phonological interference is a term that is related with interference which is focused in examined from phonological side.

In analyzing the interference, the researchers used Weinrich theory to examined the phonological interference. Weinrich had explained about the phonological interference, but he did not explain more about the kinds of phonological interference, that is the reason why the researchers used supporting theory by Crystal (2003) to make sure the data is phonological interference. Crystal divides phonological interference into three categories, they are addition, omission, and replacement. If the consonant inserted, it is called addition. If the consonant leave, it is called omission. Then, if the consonant replaced, it is called replacement.

Based on the data on findings, from 3 categories of phonological interference by Crystal the researchers found replacement phonological interference in Buginese students, while replacement and addition phonological interference in Javanese students. In Javanese society these traditions are happened from period to period of their predecessors and preserved by the local community (Hasyim, et al., 2022). From total 14 texts that observed to 20 students, the researchers found 108 data that indicated as phonological interference. On the data that have collected from both cultures, the researchers found 106 data of replacement, 2 data of addition phonological interference, and there was nothing omission phonological interference.

The students in Senior High School 2 East Luwu from both cultures have the similarities in mispronouncing /v/, /θ/, /ð/, /z/, and /ʒ/, but there are 3 fricative consonants that the researchers found as the comparison in this research from the table on the findings which are sounds {f}, {ʃ}, and {h}. The researchers found 3 data from Buginese students that were sound replacements phonological interference in pronouncing sound /f/ such as student 17 on datum 1. On the sentence *"I couldn't keep from **laughing** throughout the hole movie"*, in word **laughing** student 17 replacing sound {f} /ˈlɑːfɪŋ/ into sound {v} /ˈlɑːvɪŋ/, and also the same case for the word **if** on datum 2 and datum 3. This case happens because the Buginese students misunderstanding about the way to pronounce labiodental fricative voiced and voiceless sound. The student though that every English word that does not written with letter "f" is pronounced with sound {v} which is the labiodental fricative voiced.

Furthermore, the researchers also found sound replacement phonological interference in Javanese students on sounds {ʃ} such as student 3 on datum 94. On the sentence *"I **wish** I had a talent like that"*, in word **wish** student 3 replacing sound {ʃ} **/wɪʃ/** into sound {s} **/wɪs/**, and also the same case on datum 95 and 96. This case happen because the {ʃ} sound does not exist in Javanese so the students tend to pronounce the word **wish** with sound {s} as how it written.

The last data that different from other data that sound addition phonological interference. This type only found on Javanese students which have 2 data in sound {h} such as student 1 datum 107 and student 3 on datum 108. On the sentence *"**Honestly**, it is one of the funniest movies I've seen in a long time"*, student 1 add sound {h} **/hɒnɪstli/** in word **honestly** that probably should be silent {h} **/'ɒnɪstli/**. This case happens because the students do not know how to pronounce the word honestly so they tend to pronounce it with the written form.

The findings of the researchers above are findings that are almost similar to previous research studies such as (Making, 2017), and (Mahendra & Marantika, 2020). In addition, this finding is also related to Richard's explanation of interference related to the mother tongue. These are known as interlingual and intralingual. For datums 1, 2. and 3, it is an intralingual false concept hypothesized error because students' wrong understanding of the differences in target language items leads to wrong conceptualization, while for datums 95 and 96 it is an interlingual transfer error because students tend to be influenced by their mother tongue because they do not familiar with the sound so they changed the sound {ʃ} to sound {s}.

The last analysis is datum 107 and 108 are intralingual ignorance of rule restrictions error because students ignore the rules of the target language and use the rules of their first language with the excuse of not knowing.

The researchers found several research that also analyzes about phonological interference, as follows: (Roslina & Nurhayati, 2020) conduct research in different focused with the researchers. This journal focused to analyzing about 'vowel consonant' on the students of the EFL Class, while this research analyzing about 'consonant fricative sound' on the Buginese and Javanese students. This journal assumed that the students tend to replaced vowels and rarely add or omit them. This journal only used the theory of Crystal (2003), while this research combined the theory of Weinrich (1979) and Crystal (2003).

Utami, Wello, & Atmowardoyo, (2017) who just gave his attention more to analyzed about phonological interference through the Buginese and Makassarese. This research focused to understand both vowel and fricative consonant, while this research just focused to understand about fricative consonant. This previous research preferred to use the Ellis (1997) steps to find the student's errors when they pronouncing English. The steps were collecting the sample of this research, identify the error, describe the errors, explain the errors, and evaluate the errors. Lastly, both of this research and the previous research used two instruments, such as reading test and interview. Regarding to the factors that caused phonological interference in senior high school students when they speak English.

Based on the data that the researchers got from the interview, there are three factors causing phonological interference in Buginese and Javanese students. The factors that were found related to the factors mentioned by Weinrich (1979). The factors are explained below.

Bilingualism background

Bilingualism background is one of the factors that greatly influence phonological interference. This factor occurs because speakers tend to use two languages so the second language is affected by the first language. This factor was proven by the researchers in data 112, 113, 115, 117, and 118. The students tend to make grammatical interference

9

because of their bilingual background. The data showed that the students are not usually using those kinds of phonemes in their daily conversation.

Disloyalty to the target language

The consequences that arise due to non-compliance with the structure of the target language make bilinguals forced to use the structure of the first language in the use or utterance of words orally and in writing. This factor was proven by the researchers in data 109, 110, 111, 114, and 116. The students still lack understanding of using English properly.

The explanation above shows that this research found two factors by Weinreich (1979), which caused the phonological interference. The factors are bilingualism background and disloyalty to target language.

The factors found in this research is analogous with some previous study which used, as follows (Shanmugam, 2018) also found some factors that relate with the explanation of Weinreich, even though it was same in just one factor. The different factors found by (Masulah, 2017) in her research were lack of knowledge and Indonesian transfer. Furthermore, (Akib, 2016) which also discussed about the factors, based on the theory by Ellis' (1997 also found three factors namely interlingual factors, the overextension analogy, and transfer of structure. Interlingual emphasizes the harmful interference of the first language as the only source of errors. One example of Hindi speakers in uttering the words 'I like to read' they utter 'I read to like'. In this case, Hindi speakers pre-positioned the use of a verb while in English, it should be positioned. This kind of error results from the negative transfer of first language rules as source language to a second language system as the target language. Then, Overextension analogy is the situation where the learners tend to be wrong in using a vocabulary caused by the similarity of the first language and second language elements. For example, the word ‚month' is used to say ‚moon' in the space. The last one is transfer or structure is a kind of negative transfer made by the Facebook user because of old habits that are different from the new behavior that is learned.

The researchers strongly believes that this research is very important. It is because in language, people have to avoid interference through their conversation especially when you are a foreign language learner. People will never escape the interference that could found in almost every sentence that appears by the speakers and the listeners must be trained to explore by themselves in their mind to know the implied intent of some of the words they speak. Furthermore, this research can add new insights in the world of research especially the research about phonological interference.

CONCLUSION

In Buginese and Javanese phonological interference that the researchers found there are only two of three kinds of phonological interference by Crystal (2003). From Buginese students, the researchers only found one category of phonological interference which was sound replacements, but Javanese students found two categories of phonological interference, which were sound addition and sound replacement. The sound of replacement on Buginese students is found in consonants {f}, while the sound of replacement on Javanese students found in consonants {ʃ}. Furthermore, the researchers only found phonological interference of the sound addition in Javanese students in consonant {h} and there is no sound addition phonological interference in Buginese students. The researchers concludes that there are two factors which caused phonological interference on the Buginese and Javanese Students on Senior High School from four factors that proposed by Weinreich (1979). These four factors are: Bilingualism background and disloyalty to target language, (3) the limited vocabularies of the target language and (4) prestige and style.

10

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

This research was conducted by the researchers starting from the construction of the literature review, the data collection and the data analysis processes, and the research conclusion.

REFERENCES

Akib, R. (2016). First Language Interference in Speaking English At the. *Qalam : Jurnal Ilmu Kependidikan*, *6*(1), 22–32. https://doi.org/10.33506/jq.v6i1.249

Ambarita, E. (2021). Comparative Forms of Adjectives by Suffix–an in Toba Batak. *The Explora*, *7*(2), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.51622/explora.v7i2.521

Farisiyah, U., & Zamzani, Z. (2018, July). Languange Shift and Language Maintenance of Local Languages toward Indonesian. In *International Conference of Communication Science Research (ICCSR 2018)* (pp. 231-235). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/iccsr-18.2018.50

Ganuza, N., & Hedman, C. (2015). Struggles for legitimacy in mother tongue instruction in Sweden. *Language and Education*, *29*(2), 125-139. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.978871

Gumilar, T. (2016). Regional Languages in Indonesian Educational System: a comparison study of Javanese, Sundanese and Dayak languages teaching programs. *Investigationes Linguisticae*, (33), 29-42. https://doi.org/10.14746/il.2016.33.4

Harya, T. D. (2022). An Analysis of Advance Level Students to Perform Their Speaking English. *Bulletin of Pedagogical Research*, *2*(1), 53-63. https://doi.org/10.51278/bpr.v2i1.251

Hayati, A., Basthoh, E., & Murtazaevna, K. D. (2021). The Implementation of Talking Football Skill at Second Semester English Department of STKIP Dharma Bakti Lubuk Alung. *Bulletin of Pedagogical Research*, *1*(2), 237-242. https://doi.org/10.51278/bpr.v1i2.212

Hasyim, U. A. A., Puspita, N., Sabir, Z., & Macariola, J. S. (2022). "You Must Attend to My Wedding   *2*(2), 68-79. https://doi.org/10.51278/anglophile.v2i2.302

Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education. In *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for languag education* (pp. 29-44). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4578-0_3

Le, T. A., Moeljadi, D., Miura, Y., & Ohkuma, T. (2016, December). Sentiment analysis for low resource languages: A study on informal Indonesian tweets. In *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Asian Language Resources (ALR12)* (pp. 123-131).

Mahendra, M. W., & Marantika, I. M. Y. (2020). The Phonological Interference in EFL Reading. *ELLITE: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, *5*(1), 27–34. https://doi.org/10.32528/ellite.v5i1.3227

Making, M. (2017). *Pronunciation Errors in Reading Text Made By Second.*

Masulah, L. (2017). *an Analysis of First Language Interference Toward Students' Mastery of English As Foreign Language At Diponegoro Vocational High School Salatiga.* (0304161060).

McKenzie, B., Bull, R., & Gray, C. (2003). The effects of phonological and visual-spatial interference on children's arithmetical performance. *Educational and Child Psychology*, *20*(3), 93–108. https://doi.org/10.53841/bpsecp.2003.20.3.93

Mnasri, S., & Habbash, M. (2021). Study of the influence of Arabic mother tongue on the English language using a hybrid artificial intelligence method. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.2012809

Muhyidin, M. (2016). Phonological Interference in the English Pronunciation. *Universum*, *10*(2), 209–217. https://doi.org/10.30762/universum.v10i2.261

Pemerintah Kabupaten Luwu Timur website.
tongue influence cry melodies? A comparative study of Swedish and German newborns. *Musicae Scientiae*, *23*(2),1 43-156. https://doi.org/10.1177/1029864917733035

Putra, G. P. A. E. E. (2022). The Forms of Phonological Interference of Balinese Language Spoken in Pangsan Village Toward English. *Journal of Education, Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching*, *5*(1), 32–44. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.33059/ellite.v5i01

Roslina, R., & Nurhayati, N. (2020). The Updating Status in Facebook: The Interference of English among Users in Academic Context. *Utamax : Journal of Ultimate Research and Trends in Education*, *2*(2), 50–56. https://doi.org/10.31849/utamax.v2i2.4039

Samingan, A. (2020). Lexical interference made by EFL learners in written production. *Anglo-Saxon : Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, *11*(1), 131–142. Retrieved from https://www.journal.unrika.ac.id/index.php/jurnalanglo-saxon/article/view/2311/pdfs

Saddhono, K., & Rohmadi, M. (2014). A Sociolinguistics Study on the Use of the Javanese Language in the Learning Process in Primary Schools in Surakarta, Central Java, Indonesia. *International Education Studies*, *7*(6), 25-30. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n6p25

Shanmugam, D. (2018). *Phonological Interference in Learning English through Tamil.* *18*(49042).

Utami, D. H., Wello, M. B., & Atmowardoyo, H. (2017). The Phonological Interference of Students' First Language in Pronouncing English Sounds (A Case Study on Buginese and Makassarese Students). *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching*, *4*(2), 205. https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v4i2.4414

Subroto, E. et.al. 1991. *Tata Bahasa Deskriptif Bahasa Jawa.* Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. http://repositori.kemdikbud.go.id/2632/

Tondo, H. 2009. *Kepunahan bahasa-bahasa daerah: faktor penyebab dan implikasi etnolinguistis.* Jurnal masyarakat dan budaya, *11*(2), 277-296 https://jmb.lipi.go.id/jmb/article/view/245

Wiese, R. 2006. *Phonology: overview. Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, *9*, 562-564. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Richard-Wiese-2/publication/259081888_Phonology_Overview/links/5c64f29b45851582c3e6f46c/Phonology-Overview.pdf https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08 044854-2/00035-3

Weinreich, U. 1953. *Languages in Contact, New York. Publications of the linguistic Circle of New York*, (1), 98. Google Scholar

Weinreich, U. 1970. *Language and Contact Reading and Problems.* Google Scholar

Weinreich, U. 1979. *Language in contact. Findings and Problems.* New York.
http://library.lol/main/FDEDF6F75A7668CCE664C09C8D333C70