

Native Language Interference in EFL Students' Writing of Reflective Journal in Indonesia

Anita

State Islamic University of Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, Indonesia

anita.ftk@uinbanten.ac.id

Abdul Gafur Marzuki

State Islamic University of Datokarama Palu, Indonesia

gafurmarzuki@uindatokarama.ac.id

Ani Nuraeni Silfani

aenizilfahmi@gmail.com

State Islamic University of Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, Indonesia

Villy Al Viyani

State Islamic University of Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, Indonesia

villyalvn596@gmail.com

Ulfah

Tadulako University, Indonesia

ulfahlulu@untad.ac.id

Corresponding email: gafurmarzuki@uindatokarama.ac.id

Abstract

Since writing is a competency that prepares students to complete all of their assignments and their thesis by the end of their university studies, learning it becomes imperative. This study aims to explore how L1 interference affects the language use, accuracy, and structure of reflective journals written by EFL students. It will also investigate the types of L1 interference that are most common in EFL students' reflective journals and how these interferences affect their writing. The study also aims to provide insights into the challenges that EFL students face in writing reflective journals in English and identify effective strategies for addressing these challenges. This study was conducted by using qualitative approach with case study which is in descriptive. Results showed that Limited vocabulary is the most common sort of lexical and syntactical interference, followed in that sequence by word order, sentence structure, literal translation, verb tense and agreement, articles (a, an, and the), and false friends. Since limited vocabulary accounts for a sizable portion of interference cases 69 in total and it is the most prevalent kind. The main issue that pupils have is that they have trouble using the right words. This suggests that while expressing themselves in English, children frequently utilize phrases that might not be appropriate or have a restricted vocabulary.

Keywords: EFL; Language interference; Reflective journal; Writing

Introduction

Writing becomes an essential skill to be learned since it is one of competence which equip students to do all assignments and thesis in the end of their studentship at university. Talking about this skill, the students of Tadris Bahasa Inggris (TBI) as EFL learners is included in this discussion that they have to be able to write to accomplish

most of their tasks and final paper in English. But, since English is taught as a foreign Language in the university and schools, so they use Indonesian language as their mother tongue dominantly in their daily conversation. This condition causes mother tongue or first language interference when they studying English. This interference becomes problem when they use productive skills, especially writing skill (Albana et al., 2020; Alek et al., 2022). As a result, TBI students make mistakes because they use Indonesian writing structures when writing English, in this case in the writing of reflective journal.

Writing reflective journal for students becomes media that can be used for delivering ideas, improving English vocabulary, and the most important makes writing as a habit (Halili et al. 2018). Since the ability to write cannot be obtained instantly, a process of habituation is needed so that the product of writing will be good. However, it is also common for students translating word for word from Indonesian into English. Consequently, L1 has negative influence for EFL students when writing in English (Marzuki, 2016; Marzuki & Santiana, 2022).

In learning foreign language, mutual influence between native language and foreign language must occur, for example in the use of vocabulary considering that vocabulary has an open nature. Language contact is an event of using two languages by speakers of the same language alternately (Avadir, 2022). In this case TBI students as EFL students cannot avoid the contact of Bahasa Indonesia as their native language with English as a foreign language that they learn in the classroom. From this language contact, there is a transfer or transfer of elements from one language into another which covers all levels. As a consequence, the process of borrowing and mutual influence on other language elements is unavoidable. When two or more languages are used alternately by the same speakers, it can be said that the languages are in contact with each other. In every language contact, there is a process of mutual influence between one language and another. As a result, interference will occur, both in speaking and in writing.

Interference is a deviation from linguistic norms that occurs in the utterances of bilinguals due to their familiarity with more than one language, which is caused by language contact. In this case EFL learners cannot avoid the language contact which causes interference since they already acquired their first language or mother tongue.

Basically, in the process of learning foreign language, can be found two kinds of interference namely interlanguage interference and intralanguage. The two-form called as implicit and explicit interference. Interlanguage interference occurs when negative transfers happened because the structure of L1 and the target language has different patterns. While intra language interference happens when learners already got knowledge about the target/foreign language which make them make mistakes in their speaking or writing (Lekova, 2010).

There have been many studies discussing the interferences in learning language in EFL context but almost no study focusing on the writing of reflective journal which has big role in helping students to think and reflect on the materials they have learned. Hence, to fill this gap this study was analyzed the interference on students writing of journal reflection which is expected to have an impact on the teacher's teaching methods. Based on the previous background, the research question is that how L1 interference affects the language use, accuracy, and structure of reflective journals written by EFL students.

Research Methodology

This study was conducted by using qualitative approach with case study which is in descriptive. The study was conducted in Juli-August 2023 at English Education Department, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, Sultan Hasanuddin State Islamic University, Banten Province. The study aims to explore how L1 interference affects the language use, accuracy, and structure of reflective journals written by EFL students. It will also investigate the types of L1 interference that are most common in EFL students' reflective journals and how these interferences affect their writing. The study also aims to provide insights into the challenges that EFL students face in writing reflective journals in English and identify effective strategies for addressing these challenges. In this study, the researchers used documentation and interview to collect the data.

Since the data being collected are in the form of qualitative data, the qualitative data analysis technique from (Miles and Huberman 1984) is used. There are three main steps in analyzing the data, namely: (1) Data reduction, (2) Data display, dan (3) Data drawing/verification. Qualitative data analysis is inductive and on-going to get the ultimate understanding of the topic being investigated.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

The researchers analyzed the most dominant type of interference occurs in students' writing. The researchers divided them into two parts namely lexical interference and syntactical interference, then the researchers concluded which type is dominant from sub-type based on both of the interference type.

Table 1
Lexical Interference Occurs in Students' Writing

| No. | Type of Language Interference | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|
| | Lexical Interference | | | |
| | False Friends | Limited Vocabulary | Literal Translation | Collocations |
| 1. | Student 1a Student 1b | Student 1 | Student 1 | Student 1 |
| 2. | - | Student 2 | Student 2 | Student 2 |
| 3. | - | Student 3a Student 3b | Student 3 | Student 3 |
| 4. | Student 4 | Student 4 | Student 4 | Student 4 |
| 5. | Student 5 | Student 5 | Student 5 | Student 5 |
| 6. | - | Student 6 | Student 6 | Student 6 |
| 7. | - | Student 7 | Student 7 | Student 7a Student 7b |
| 8. | - | Student 8 | Student 8 | Student 8 |
| 9. | - | Student 9a Student 9b | Student 9 | Student 9 |
| 10. | - | Student 10a Student 10b | Student 10 | Student 10 |
| 11. | - | Student 11a Student 11b | Student 11 | Student 11 |
| 12. | - | Student 12a Student 12b | Student 12 | Student 12a Student 12b |
| 13. | - | Student 13a Student 13b Student 13c | - | Student 13 |
| 14. | - | Student 14a Student 14b Student 14c | - | - |
| 15. | - | Student 15a Student 15b Student 15c | - | Student 15 |
| No. | Type of Language Interference | | | |
| | Lexical Interference | | | |
| | False Friends | Limited Vocabulary | Literal Translation | Collocations |
| 16. | - | Student 16a Student 16b Student 16c Student 16d | Student 16 | Student 16 |
| 17. | Student 17 | Student 17a Student 17b Student 17c | - | Student 17 |
| 18. | - | Student 18a Student 18b Student 18c Student 18d | Student 18 | Student 18 |
| 19. | - | Student 19a Student 19b Student 19c Student 19d Student 19e Student 19f Student 19g | Student 19 | Student 19a Student 19b |

| | | | | |
|--------------|------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 20. | | Student 20a Student 20b Student 20c Student 20d Student 20e | Student 20 | Student 20 |
| 21. | | Student 21a Student 21b Student 21c Student 21d Student 21e | Student 21 | Student 21 |
| 22. | | Student 22a Student 22b Student 22c Student 22d | Student 22 | Student 22 |
| 23. | | Student 23a Student 23b Student 23c | Student 23 | Student 23 |
| 24. | | Student 24a Student 24b Student 24c | Student 24 | Student 24 |
| 25. | | Student 25 | Student 25 | Student 25 |
| 26. | Student 26 | Student 26a Student 26b | Student 26 | Student 26a Student 26b |
| 27. | | Student 27a Student 27b | Student 27a Student 27b | Student 27 |
| Total | 6 | 69 | 24 | 30 |

Based on the table above, the researchers described the results from each type as follows:

There were 6 cases of false friends in the students' reflective journals. This occurs when students use words or phrases that sound similar in English but have different meanings. For instance, using "bicycle" in English when it should be "motorcycle" in the Indonesian context. The reason for false friends is the influence of words that sound similar between Indonesian and English but have different meanings.

Interference in the form of limited vocabulary appeared 69 times. Students tend to use simple or limited vocabulary in English, which may be due to a lack of a broad vocabulary. For example, the use of "excited to learning" instead of "excited to learn." This indicates that students might not be familiar with the wide range of vocabulary required to express their thoughts in English.

Literal translation interference occurred 24 times. This happens when students translate sentences or phrases from Indonesian to English word-for-word without considering English language structures and idioms. For example, using "I feel a little hungry cuz before going to college just drink some water" when it should be "I feel a little hungry because I only had some water before going to college." Students might be too focused on translating word by word, disregarding the correct sentence structure in English.

Interference at the collocation level was found 30 times. Students tend to use words or phrases in combinations that are uncommon in English. For instance, using "activities about today" instead of "today's activities." This suggests that students might not be accustomed to common collocations in English. The reason for this interference is the lack of exposure to proper English and practice in its appropriate context.

It can be take a conclusion that limited vocabulary type is the most dominant type of interference in students' writing journal.

Table 2
Syntactical Interference Occurs in Students' Writing

| No. | Type of Language Interference | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| | Syntactical Interference | | | |
| | Word Order | Sentence Structure | Verb Tense and Agreement | Articles (a, an, the) |
| 1. | Student 1 | - | Student 1a Student 1b Student 1c | Student 1 Student 1 |
| 2. | Student 2 | Student 2 | Student 2 | Student 2 |
| 3. | Student 3 | Student 3 | Student 3 | Student 3 |
| 4. | Student 4 | Student 4 | Student 4 | Student 4 |
| 5. | Student 5 | Student 5 | Student 5 | Student 5 |
| 6. | Student 6 | Student 6 | Student 6 | Student 6 |
| 7. | Student 7 | Student 7a Student 7b | Student 7 | Student 7 |
| 8. | Student 8a Student 8b | Student 8a Student 8b | Student 8 | Student 8 |
| 9. | Student 9 | Student 9 | Student 9 | Student 9 |
| 10. | Student 10a Student 10b | Student 10a Student 10b | Student 10 | Student 10a Student 10b |
| 11. | Student 11 | Student 11a Student 11b Student 11c | Student 11a Student 11b | Student 11 |
| 12. | Student 12a Student 12b | Student 12a Student 12b | Student 12a Student 12b | Student 12 |
| 13. | Student 13 | Student 13a Student 13b | Student 13 | - |
| 14. | Student 14a Student 14b | Student 14 | Student 14 Student 14b | - |
| 15. | Student 15a Student 15b | Student 15a Student 15b | - | - |
| 16. | Student 16a Student 16b Student 16c | Student 16a Student 16b | Student 16 | - |
| No. | Type of Language Interference | | | |
| | Syntactical Interference | | | |
| | Word Order | Sentence Structure | Verb Tense and Agreement | Articles (a, an, the) |
| 17. | Student 17a Student 17b | Student 17 | Student 17 | - |
| 18. | Student 18a Student 18b Student 18c Student 18d Student 18e Student 18f | Student 18 | Student 18a Student 18b | - |
| 19. | Student 19a Student 19b Student 19c Student 19d Student 19e Student 19f | Student 19a Student 19b | Student 19a Student 19b Student 19c | - |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|--|---|----------------------------|
| 20. | Student 20a Student 20b Student 20c Student 20d Student 20e Student 20f Student 20g Student 20h Student 20i Student 20j | Student 20 | Student 20a Student 20b | |
| 21. | Student 21a Student 21b Student 21c | Student 21a Student 21b Student 21c | - | Student 21 |
| 22. | Student 22a Student 22b Student 22c Student 22d Student 22e | Student 22a Student 22b Student 22c Student 22d | Student 22 | Student 22 |
| 23. | Student 23a Student 23b | Student 23a Student 23b | Student 23a Student 23b Student 23c | Student 23 |
| 24. | Student 24 | Student 24 | - | Student 24a Student 24b |
| 25. | Student 25 | Student 25 | Student 25 | Student 25 |
| 26. | Student 26a Student 26b | Student 26a Student 26b Student 26c | Student 26a Student 26b | Student 26 |
| 27. | Student 27a Student 27b | Student 27a Student 27b | Student 27a Student 27b | Student 27 |
| | 63 | 45 | 37 | 22 |

Based on the table above, the researchers describe the results from each type as follows:

The high occurrence of word order interference, with 63 instances, suggests that students often struggle with arranging words in the correct order in their English sentences. For instance, "Today first time go to campus from house very far" illustrates this issue. Students may be influenced by the different word order patterns in Indonesian and find it challenging to adapt to English word order conventions.

The 45 cases of sentence structure interference point to challenges students face in constructing English sentences properly. An example, "today first time go to campus from house very far," shows issues related to sentence structure. This indicates that students may not be proficient in crafting sentences that adhere to English grammatical rules.

Interference in verb tense and agreement is noticeable with 37 instances. This suggests that students struggle with using the correct verb tenses and maintaining subject-verb agreement. For instance, "Because today I go to campus with my sister" is an example of this issue. It indicates that students might have difficulty distinguishing between present and past tenses or maintaining agreement between subjects and verbs in English.

The presence of 22 cases of articles (a, an, the) interference indicates that students sometimes omit or misuse articles in their sentences. For instance, "I want to learn more the pronouncing word well" should be "I want to learn how to pronounce words well." The use of "the" in this sentence is not typical in English. Articles like "a" or "an" are typically not used before the gerund "pronouncing." Students might not be accustomed to using articles appropriately in English, which is common due to differences in article usage between Indonesian and English.

In terms of lexical and syntactical interference, the most dominant type is limited vocabulary, followed by word order, sentence structure, literal translation, verb tense and agreement, articles (a, an, the), and false friend in that hierarchy. Limited Vocabulary is the most dominant type of interference because it accounts for a significant number of cases, namely 69 instances.

In this interview section, the researchers employed a semi-structured interview approach to gather data about students' experiences, perceptions, and practices concerning factors contributing to interference in their reflective journal writing, as well as their use of their native language (L1) in this process. This interview question is in English, but the researchers also translates it into Indonesian to clarify the question's meaning. Therefore, some students respond in Indonesian. However, since the research report is in English, the researchers translate all the interview results into English.

Eight distinct factors were identified as indicators of the causes of interference in students' reflective journal writing. For each of these indicators, two interview questions were posed to a group of 27 TBI UIN Banten students. These indicators include **The Interlingual Factor (Cross-Linguistic Interference), The Overextension of Analogy, Transfer of Structure, Transfer of Lexicon (Vocabulary), Native Language Syntax and Word Order, Phonological Interference, Sociocultural and Pragmatic Factors, and Overgeneralization of L2 Rules.**

a. The Interlingual Factor (Cross-Linguistic Interference)

This factor investigates the causes of language interference in English language learning among Indonesian students. It is also known as "The Interlingual Factor (Cross-Linguistic Interference)," explores the challenges faced by students due to differences between English and Indonesian grammar and sentence structures.

The first set of interview question aimed to understand how cross-linguistic differences between English and Indonesian affect students' English language learning. The interview question is "Can you describe any instances where you've found it challenging to apply English grammar or sentence structures because of differences with Indonesian". The majority of the students (22 out of 27) acknowledged that they face challenges in applying English grammar and sentence structures due to these differences, indicating the prevalence of this issue among learners. These are the examples of their responses:

Several students reported difficulties in distinguishing between English verb tenses. For instance,

Student 1 admitted, "I still have difficulty distinguishing between verb 1, 2, and 3." Student 2 shared a similar sentiment, saying, "I struggle with applying grammar, especially tenses."

Some students found it challenging to determine the correct usage of verbs in specific contexts. Student 2 explained,

"Sometimes I'm confused about whether to use verb 1, verb 2, or verb 3." Student 8 expressed, "I find it difficult to write grammar, and I sometimes forget the grammar rules and don't memorize verbs two and three."

The second set interview is to know the language features unconsciously used by the students when writing English. The interview question is "Are there specific Indonesian language features that you find yourself unconsciously using when writing in English?". Many of the students (24 out of 27) admitted to unconsciously using certain Indonesian language features when writing in English, such as word order or the placement of words, which can be influenced by their native language's structure. This can result in sentences that sound unnatural or differ from standard English. These are the examples of their responses:

Carrying over Indonesian Sentence Structures: Student 1 explained, "Sometimes, yes, because I'm still influenced by the sentence structures in the Indonesian language." Student 6 added, "Sometimes, I tend to arrange words according to Indonesian."

Word Order and Structure: Student 2 shared, "In writing, for example, 'jurnal reflektif' should be 'reflective journal'." Student 5 explained, "Sometimes, yes, because we are not very familiar with it and have reached a dead end, so we just write it as is."

The findings from this set of interviews indicate that the interlingual factor, or cross-linguistic interference, significantly influences English language learning among Indonesian students. Differences in grammar, vocabulary, sentence

structure, and pronunciation between English and Indonesian often pose challenges for learners. These results highlight the need for tailored pedagogical approaches to address these specific language interference issues.

b. The Overextension of Analogy

This second factor explores language interference factors affecting Indonesian students learning English. The second factor, "The Overextension of Analogy," examines instances where students attempt to apply Indonesian language rules or patterns to English writing and the consequences of these attempts. The overextension of analogy is a notable factor in language interference, where students draw from their native language, Indonesian, and apply its rules or patterns to English writing. This study examines the impact of these attempts on English language learners.

The first set of interview question sought to understand whether students had ever tried to apply rules or patterns from Indonesian to their English writing. The interview question is "Have you ever tried to apply rules or patterns from Indonesian to English writing? Could you provide examples?". Over a half of the students (15 out of 27) acknowledged making such attempts, often resulting in errors or unnatural phrasing in English. Examples include using "many" instead of "much," or maintaining the same adjective order as in Indonesian, which can lead to odd-sounding sentences in English. However, a minority of students (12 out of 27) reported not experiencing such attempts consciously. These are the examples of their responses:

1) Attempted to Apply Indonesian Patterns to English Writing:

Some students shared instances where they had consciously tried to apply Indonesian patterns to English writing. Student 1 provided an example, saying, "Yes, for example:

'sepatu cantik,' I mentioned it as 'shoes beautiful,' which is not the correct way." Student 2 mentioned, "Yes, for example, 'many sugar' should be 'much sugar.'" Student 21 described an attempt when not knowing the meaning, stating, "Yes, when I didn't know the meaning, for example: 'hari ini saya tidak baik,' but I wrote it as 'I'm not good.'"

2) No Experience of Applying Indonesian Patterns:

A group of students (Student 3, Student 4, Student 5, Student 7, Student 9, Student 13, Student 15, Student 19, Student 22, Student 23, Student 26, Student 27) indicated that they have not consciously applied Indonesian patterns to English writing.

The findings from this set of interviews demonstrate that many Indonesian students have attempted to apply Indonesian language patterns to their English writing, resulting in language interference. This emphasizes the significance of addressing these interference patterns to enhance English writing proficiency.

The second set of interview question aimed to determine whether students have used English words or phrases incorrectly based on their understanding of Indonesian with a question "Are there situations where you've used an English word or phrase incorrectly based on your understanding of Indonesian?". A considerable number of students (20 out of 27) admitted to such instances, where their use of English words or phrases did not align with standard English, mainly due to the influence of their native language.

c. Transfer of Structure

The third factor, "Transfer of Structure," investigates whether students follow Indonesian sentence structure patterns when composing sentences in English and how this influences their writing. The transfer of structure is a significant factor contributing to language interference, where Indonesian students often apply sentence structure patterns from their native language to English. This study explores the impact of such transfers on their English writing.

The first set of interview question aimed to determine whether students sometimes follow Indonesian sentence structure patterns when composing sentences in English. The interview question is "When composing sentences in English, do you sometimes follow sentence structure patterns from Indonesian? Can you give examples?" A substantial majority of students (26 out of 27) indicated that they do, which can result in language interference and incorrect sentence structures in their writing. These are the examples of their responses:

1) Following Indonesian Sentence Structure Patterns:

Several students provided examples of situations where they follow Indonesian sentence structure patterns when composing sentences in English. For instance,

Student 2 gave an example: "I like playing volleyball" instead of "I enjoy playing volleyball." Student 6 mentioned, "Buku hitam becomes book black."

The findings from this first set of interviews indicate that many Indonesian students have experienced using English words or phrases incorrectly based on their understanding of Indonesian. This factor contributes to language interference and emphasizes the need to address these language patterns for improved English writing proficiency.

The second set of interview questions sought to understand whether students had noticed instances where the structure of their English sentences didn't match what they intended to convey. The interview question is "'Have you noticed any instances where the structure of your English sentences doesn't match what you intended to convey?'" All students (27 out of 27) reported experiencing such instances. These are the examples of their responses:

1) Noticing Mismatched Sentence Structure:

The Students provided examples of situations where the structure of their English sentences did not match their intended meaning. Student 10 cited an example, saying, "Yes, for example, 'appropriate order.' I just learned the vocabulary, so I'm still confused about whether it's correct or not, because my friend has been using a different word all along during presentations." Student 14 explained, "I have, but after that, I will grasp it based on what I think is correct and connected because when speaking or writing in English, I never follow the grammar, but rather what I believe is correct, even though sometimes I follow the grammar."

The findings from this second set of interviews indicate that all Indonesian students have noticed instances where the structure of their English sentences doesn't match what they intended to convey. This underscores the importance of addressing transfer of structure to enhance clarity in English writing among these students.

d. Transfer of Lexicon (Vocabulary)

This fourth factor investigates whether students have used Indonesian words or phrases in their English writing and the consequences of such usage. The transfer of lexicon is a significant factor contributing to language interference, as Indonesian students may inadvertently incorporate Indonesian words or phrases into their English writing. This study examines the impact of such transfers on the clarity and accuracy of their English writing.

The first set of interview question aimed to understand whether students have used Indonesian words or phrases in their English writing. The interview question is "Are there words or phrases in Indonesian that you've used in your English writing? Could you share some examples?" A significant number of students (21 out of 27) reported encountering situations where they've used Indonesian words or phrases in their English writing. These are the examples of their responses 1) Using Indonesian Words or Phrases in English Writing: Several students provided examples of words or phrases they have used in their English writing. For example, Student 2 mentioned using "paragraf" instead of "paragraph." Student 15 shared an example of using "paragraf" in place of "paragraph." These responses highlight the challenges faced by Indonesian students in maintaining accurate vocabulary use in their English writing, as they may inadvertently use Indonesian words or phrases.

The findings from the first set of interviews indicate that a significant number of Indonesian students have encountered instances where they've used Indonesian words or phrases in their English writing. This factor contributes to language interference and emphasizes the need for increased awareness and accurate vocabulary use in English writing among these students.

The second set of interview question aimed to understand whether students have encountered difficulties in finding the right English word or phrase to express concepts that they can easily convey in Indonesian. The second question is "Have you ever struggled to find the right English word or phrase to express something you can easily convey in Indonesian?" These students (26 students) have experienced difficulties when trying to find the right English word or phrase to express something they can easily convey in Indonesian. These are the examples of their responses:

1) Struggling to find the right English word or phrase:

The majority of students (26 out of 27) expressed difficulties in finding the right English word or phrase. Student 1 mentioned a specific challenge in determining whether a word belongs to verb 1, verb 2, or even verb 3. The remaining students (Student 2, Student 3, Student 4, Student 6, Student 7, Student 8, Student 9, Student 10, Student 11, Student 12, Student 13, Student 15, Student 16, Student 17, Student 18, Student 20, Student 21, Student 22, Student 23, Student 24, Student 25, Student 26, Student 27) expressed difficulties in differentiating between verb forms (e.g., verb 1, verb 2) and in effectively expressing themselves in English. These

responses highlight the challenge of selecting the right words or verb forms in English, especially when the equivalent concept is straightforward in Indonesian. It shows how nuances in verb forms can be tricky when switching between languages.

The findings from the second set of interviews indicate that a significant number of Indonesian students have experienced challenges in finding the right English words or phrases to express ideas that they can effortlessly convey in Indonesian. This factor contributes to language interference and underscores the importance of expanding their English vocabulary and improving vocabulary-related language skills.

e. Native Language Syntax and Word Order

The fifth factor, "Native Language Syntax and Word Order," investigates whether students often notice differences in word order between Indonesian and English when writing, along with examples they provide. Native language syntax and word order can be a significant factor contributing to language interference, as Indonesian students may encounter challenges when transitioning between Indonesian and English syntax patterns. This study examines the impact of these challenges on their English writing.

The first set of interview question aimed to determine whether students often notice differences in word order between Indonesian and English when writing, and if so, whether they can provide examples. The interview question is "Do you often notice differences in word order between Indonesian and English when writing? Can you provide examples?" A majority of students (25 out of 27) responded positively and provided examples. These are the examples of their responses:

1) Differences in Word Order

Between Indonesian and English: Students shared instances where they often notice differences in word order between Indonesian and English when writing. Student 8 mentioned, "Yes, often, because the word order in English is reversed from Indonesian. For example, 'bottle cute' should be 'cute bottle.'" Student 11 admitted, "Yes, I often notice it. For example, it should be 'i like strawberry mochi,' but I end up writing 'i like mochi strawberry'." Student 15 noted, "Yes, like sentences that need to be rearranged, and also distinguishing between verb 1 and verb 2." Student 20 explained, "I often notice it. In English, possessive words are at the beginning of a sentence, for example: 'my apple.' But in Indonesian, possessive

words come at the end, for example: 'apel saya.'" These responses underscore the challenges faced by Indonesian students in navigating differences in word order between their native language and English.

The findings from the first set of interviews indicate that a majority of Indonesian students often notice differences in word order between Indonesian and English when writing. This factor contributes to language interference and underscores the importance of addressing native language syntax and word order differences in English language learning.

The second set of interview question aimed to understand whether students find specific English sentence structures challenging because they differ from Indonesian. The interview question is "Are there specific English sentence structures that you find challenging because they differ from Indonesian?" All students (27 out of 27) reported finding specific English sentence structures challenging for this reason. These are the examples of their responses:

Students shared examples of specific English sentence structures that they find challenging due to differences from Indonesian. Student 2 highlighted, "In English, there are many tenses that often confuse and challenge me." Student 4 pointed out, "Yes, there are, especially with tenses, which really confuse me." Student 6 explained, "Yes, it's related to v1, v2, and v3.

f. Phonological Interference

The sixth factor, "Phonological Interference," investigates whether students have encountered difficulties with English pronunciation influenced by Indonesian phonology and provides examples from their responses. Phonological interference, stemming from the influence of Indonesian phonology, can be a significant factor contributing to language interference in English pronunciation for Indonesian students. This study examines the difficulties encountered by students in English pronunciation due to the impact of Indonesian phonology.

The first set of interview question aimed to determine whether students have encountered difficulties with English pronunciation that they believe might be influenced by Indonesian phonology. The interview question is "Have you encountered difficulties with English pronunciation that you think might be influenced by Indonesian phonology? Could you describe them?" All students

except Student 14 reported experiencing such difficulties. These are the examples of their responses:

1) Difficulties with English Pronunciation Influenced by Indonesian Phonology:

Students provided examples of English words or sounds that they find challenging to pronounce, influenced by Indonesian phonology. Student 2 stated, "Yes, I often experience difficulties when pronouncing English words. In English, sometimes 'u' becomes 'a,' for example, 'structure' ('strakcer') is sometimes pronounced as 'struktur.'" Student 6 shared, "Yes, I have, for example, when pronouncing 'Enough.'" Student 11 mentioned, "A lot, for example, in pronouncing 'thanks,' 'structure,' 'wait,' etc." Student 19 indicated, "Yes, like 'grafik' ('graph')."

The second set of interview question aimed to understand whether students find specific English sounds or sound combinations particularly challenging to pronounce correctly. The question is "Are there English sounds or sound combinations that you find particularly challenging to pronounce correctly?" All students reported finding certain English sounds or sound combinations challenging due to differences from Indonesian phonology. These are the examples of their responses: 1) Challenging English Sounds and Sound Combinations: Students provided examples of English words or sounds that they find particularly challenging to pronounce correctly. Student 1 cited examples like "although," "through," "tough," and "though." Student 7 admitted to finding challenges with words like "lamp" and "lamb." These responses demonstrate the complexities of English pronunciation, particularly when compared to Indonesian phonology. Students commonly face challenges in accurately pronouncing specific English words and sounds.

The findings from the second set of interviews confirm that all students encounter difficulties with specific English sounds or sound combinations when pronouncing words, primarily due to differences between English and Indonesian phonology. This factor contributes to language interference and highlights the need for targeted phonological training to enhance English pronunciation among these students.

g. Sociocultural and Pragmatic Factors

The sixth factor, "Sociocultural and Pragmatic Factors," investigates whether students have encountered instances where their writing in English doesn't align with

English sociocultural norms or pragmatic conventions and provides examples from their responses. Sociocultural and pragmatic factors play a vital role in language interference, particularly in English writing by Indonesian students. This study examines the challenges students face when their writing in English does not align with sociocultural norms and pragmatic conventions.

The first set of interview question aimed to understand whether students have encountered instances where their English writing does not align with English sociocultural norms or pragmatic conventions. The interview question is "Have you ever found that your writing in English doesn't align with English sociocultural norms or pragmatic conventions? Can you share instances?" The majority of students (25 out of 27) responded affirmatively and provided examples. These are the examples of their responses:

1) Instances of Non-Alignment with Sociocultural Norms and Pragmatic Conventions:

Students shared examples of situations where their writing in English did not align with English sociocultural norms or pragmatic conventions. Student 2 mentioned, "Yes, for example, in English letter writing, using 'dear mr. holmes.'" Student 7 shared an example of not using a greeting like "Hello" when starting a conversation. Student 10 illustrated, "It should be 'dear madam,' but it turns into 'Prof, I want to ask." Student 18 discussed issues with the usage of phrases like "Can I," "May I," and "Could." These examples showcase the challenges students face in aligning their English writing with the sociocultural norms and pragmatic conventions of the English language.

The second set of interview question aimed to explore whether students experience situations where they need to be more direct or indirect in their English writing, and if this differs from their communication style in Indonesian. The interview question is "Are there situations where you feel the need to be more direct or indirect in your English writing, and does this differ from how you would communicate in Indonesian?" The majority of students (22 out of 27) reported encountering such situations and provided examples. These are the examples of their responses:

1) Directness and Indirectness in English Writing:

Students shared instances where they needed to adjust the directness or indirectness of their English writing, highlighting the differences compared to their communication style in Indonesian. Student 14 noted, "Yes, especially when I talk

with older people. It's different because speaking in Indonesian with older individuals requires me to be more careful in word or sentence selection, while in English, most of them speak politely and casually regardless of age." Student 20 expressed, "Yes, sometimes, it feels awkward to use Indonesian, and it's more comfortable to use English." Student 25 explained, "There are times when I want to speak to older people, as it's more polite to use English. For example, 'could you please,' whereas in Indonesia, it's 'bisakah kamu...' So, it's more convenient to use English." These examples reveal that students often adapt the directness or indirectness of their English writing based on sociocultural and pragmatic considerations, which may differ from their communication style in Indonesian.

The findings from the second set of interviews show that a significant majority of students (22 out of 27) encounter situations where they need to adjust the directness or indirectness of their English writing, primarily based on sociocultural and pragmatic factors. These sociocultural and pragmatic factors contribute to language interference, highlighting the importance of understanding the sociocultural nuances in English writing among these students.

h. Overgeneralization of L2 Rules

The first of interview question aimed to understand whether students sometimes apply English grammar rules more broadly than they should be applied. The question is "Do you sometimes apply English grammar rules more broadly than they should be applied? Can you provide examples?" Some students (15 out of 27) indicated that they have engaged in such practices or provided examples, while others (13 out of 27) answered negatively. These are the examples of their responses:

1) Application of Grammar Rules:

Students shared their experiences in applying English grammar rules more extensively than necessary and provided illustrative examples. Student 1 mentioned, "Yes, for example, 'sepatu cantik' becomes 'shoes beautiful,' which should not be the case." Student 2 provided an example, "Yes, for example, 'many sugar' instead of 'much sugar.'" Student 21 acknowledged, "Yes, sometimes, like 'ketika saya tidur' becomes 'when I sleep,' but it should be 'when I am sleeping.'" "

2) No Overgeneralization of L2 Rules:

Some students (13 out of 27) stated that they do not typically apply English grammar rules more broadly than required. However, none of these students provided illustrative examples in their responses.

The findings from this set of interviews suggest that a substantial number of students (15 out of 27) have engaged in the overgeneralization of English grammar rules, potentially leading to language interference in their writing. However, it is essential to recognize that not all students exhibit this behavior, as some (13 out of 27) indicated that they do not typically apply grammar rules more broadly than required.

The second set of interview questions aimed to understand whether students sometimes use tenses or structures in English that do not match the intended meaning due to overgeneralization. The interview question is "Are there instances where you've used a tense or structure in English that doesn't match the intended meaning because of an overgeneralization?" All of the students (27 out of 27) provided responses, and they fell into different categories based on their answers. These are the examples of their answer:

1) Overgeneralization of Tenses and Structures:

All of the students (27 out of 27) acknowledged that they often or sometimes use tenses or structures in English that do not match the intended meaning due to overgeneralization. Student 6 admitted, "Yes, sometimes when I'm writing, I forget to review the correct language structure." Student 17 shared, "Yes, for example, I should use the present tense, but I end up using the past tense." Student 21 stated, "Yes, I often use tenses or structures incorrectly." These responses indicate that overgeneralization of tenses and structures is a common challenge for these students, leading to language interference in their English writing.

Discussion

Learners of a foreign language often experience what is referred to as cross-linguistic influence or, simply speaking, language interference. As Hidayati (2018) and Putriani (2020) state that when the structure, vocabulary and rules of a learner's first language (L1) interfere with her/his use of the target language (L2), causing errors or non-native like usage. In contrast, reflective journals in writing are the most susceptible for native language interference in English as Foreign Language (EFL) country like Indonesia (Rezeki, 2016; Hapsari & Sukavatee, 2018). Hence reflective journals can be seen as a means of promoting self-awareness and critical thinking for students to express on paper thoughts, feelings and experiences (Xhemaili & Maliqi, 2024). In their writing in these journals, though, the influence of Bahasa

Indonesia the national language frequently is apparent and alters its way out into everything written by students through English.

1. The Nature of Native Language Interference

In writing, native language interference may appear as the direct translation of idiomatic expressions and the employment of L1 sentence patterns or vocabulary rather than finding an appropriate similar formation in L2. In the case of Indonesian EFL learners, these perceptions are usually based on substantial discrepancies in grammar, syntax and vocabulary between Bahasa Indonesia with English (Amna, 2018).

For example, Bahasa Indonesia has a flexible word order compared to English and does not have articles like "a" or "the". Therefore, the student may end up giving unfinished sentences or entirely omitting from articles when writing in English. Moreover, Bahasa Indonesia only have a simple tense and it can cause you trouble while using tenses in English especially writing reflection which usually shift their subject to the past present or future.

2. Impacts on Reflective Journal Writing

On their reflective journal writing, native language interference has the potential to have a substantial effect on EFL students. One, because it can cause poor grammar which makes the conveyed ideas difficult to communicate. For instance, the structure of "Saya sangat suka membaca" in Bahasa Indonesia with words (Subject very like Object) might be direct translated into English as: I Very Like Reading and resulted in a not normal sentence as above.

This in turn results to the utilization of inexact or wrong words due to vocabulary interference. This is commonly the case when students meet an English word without any equal translation in Bahasa Indonesia or idiom expression while trying to understand the meaning. So a student from Indonesia would be tempted to translate "Saya malas melakukannya" as "I am lazy do it," where English does not allow this construction.

At last, the rhetorical style Bahasa Indonesia provide will be affecting on how students organize and construct their reflective journals in term if organization and coherence (Putriani, 2020). Writing in Indonesian is the opposite of English, which tends to illustrate with directness and logistical transition. However, this way of reflection is unfamiliar to students who might find it as difficult and challenging for writing in English style.

3. Strategies to Mitigate Native Language Interference

Several strategies are available to counteract native language interference in reflective journal writing. A good one is explicit instruction in the foundational grammar, syntax and rhetorical style differences between Indonesian language (Bahasa Indonesia)-English. In this way, teachers can help students to recognize these differences and avoid many of the pitfalls which lie in wait for them (Hidayati, 2018).

The other strategies is contrastive analysis in which students compare and contrast sentences or paragraphs between Bahasa Indonesia to English. This helps these to determine areas where disturbance can certainly happen and know how the process is generally discouraged. Moreover, lots of practice in using English structure and vocabulary for example by writing reflective journals checked through feedback from teachers as early intervention support measure can be useful.

These could also include peer review and collaborative writing exercises. Students will also be able to see their own writing through the eyes of another learner and can begin learning how to detect language interference in their written work. In addition, they can recommend more extensive reading in English based on reflective writing to provide students with native examples of language use that will continue to minimize interference.

Conclusion

In terms of lexical and syntactical interference, the most dominant type is limited vocabulary, followed by word order, sentence structure, literal translation, verb tense and agreement, articles (a, an, the), and false friend in that hierarchy. Limited Vocabulary is the most dominant type of interference because it accounts for a significant number of cases, namely 69 instances. The difficulty in using the appropriate vocabulary is the primary challenge faced by the students. This indicates that students tend to use words that may not be suitable or have a limited vocabulary when expressing themselves in English. Limited vocabulary can impact better comprehension and expression in English. Therefore, further vocabulary mastery and practice in its usage need to be improved to address this issue.

References

- Abdussamad Z. (2021). *Metode penelitian kualitatif[qualitative research method]*. Syakir Media Press.
- Albana, H. H., Marzuki, A. G., Alek, A., & Hidayat, D. N. (2020). Cohesive devices in student's writing (a discourse analysis on argumentative text). *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 8(1), 6-11.
- Alek, A., Marzuki, A. G., Hidayat, D. N., & Fauzji, F. (2022). The discourse structure and linguistic features of research articles and thesis abstracts in English by Indonesian academics. *JELITA: Journal of Education, Language Innovation, and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 37-44.
- Arikunto, S. (2009). *Manajemen penelitian (Research management)*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Avadir, J.K. (2022). Language Contact as One of the Forms of Realization of Bilingualism and Interference. *Universidad Y Sociedad: Revista Científica de La Universidad de Cienfuegos* 14(3):94–101.
- Azar, B. S. (2011). *Understanding and using English grammar*. Pearson.
- Brown, D. (1987). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Budiharto, R. & Agus. (2019). Native language interference on target language writings of Indonesian EFL Students: An Exploratory Case Study." *Indonesian EFL Journal* 5(1):107. doi: 10.25134/ieflij.v5i1.1630.
- Cabrera Solano, Paola Alexandra, Paul Fernando Gonzalez Torres, Cesar Augusto Ochoa Cueva, Ana Lucia Quinonez Beltran, Luz Mercedes Castillo Cuesta, Lida Mercedes Solano Jaramillo, Franklin Oswaldo Espinosa Jaramillo, and Maria Olivia Arias Cordova. (2014). "Spanish Interference in EFL Writing Skills: A Case of Ecuadorian Senior High Schools." *English Language Teaching* 7(7):40–48. doi: 10.5539/elt.v7n7p40.
- Chicho, Kanar Zirak Haseeb. (2022). An analysis of factors influencing efl learners' writing skills. *Canadian Journal of Language and Literature Studies* 2(2):28–38. doi: 10.53103/cjlls.v2i2.38.
- Cogni, Mara. (2019). *From sentences to essays: A Guide to Reflective Writing through Reflective Thinking: Student's Edition (Education)*. Vernon Press.
- Corder, S. p. (1981). *Error analysis and interlingua*. London Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2016). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among 5 Approaches*. 4th ed. Sage Publisher.
- Darnell, F. M. (2008). *False friends in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Denzin, and Lincoln. (1997). *Handbook of qualitative research*. 1st ed. India: SAGE Publication.
- Djedelbert L., Yandres A. (2020). First language interferences into English writing skill of the Xiith grade students of Sma Negeri 1 Kupang in Academic Year 2017/2018." *International Journal of Research - GRANTHAALAYAH* 5(12):33–44. doi: 10.29121/granthaalayah.v5.i12.2017.471.
- Fauziah, L. R. (2015). Language interference of Batak Angkola-Mandailing Language to Indonesian: A Case Study. *UPI Passage Journal* 3(2):64–76.
- Gorbet, F. (1979). *To Error Is Human: Error analysis and child language acquisition*.
- Hajar, Ibnu, Kisman Salija, and Andi Muliati. (2019). The Interference of Indonesian on the students' English writing of Muhammadiyah.1–7.

- Halili, M., D. Hikmah, M. Roifah. (2018). Student reflective journal sebagai booster peningkatan profisiensi menulis mahasiswa [student reflective journal as booster to enhance writing proficiency].259–272.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Longman: Person Education Limited.
- Hinkel, E. (2015). *Teaching academic ESL Writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Routledge.
- Irmalia, M. (2016). Indonesian interference in students writing. *English Education Journal* 7(4):496–508.
- Richards, J.C. (1971). *A Non- Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis*. 1st ed. Routledge.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of language and teaching*. New York, London: Pearson education limited.
- Larson-Hall, J. (2010). *A Guide to doing statistics in second language research using SPSS*. Routledge.
- Lekova, B. (2010). language interference and methods of its overcoming in foreign language teaching. *Trakia Journal of Sciences* 8:320–24.
- Marzuki, A.G. (2016). Utilizing cooperative learning in islamic college students' classroom, *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 3(2), 123-139.
- Marzuki, A. G., & Santiana, S. (2022, August 16). *Fostering students' autonomous learning with padlet in writing class*. Retrieved from osf.io/qbjmv
- Matras, Y. (2020). *Language contact*. 2nd ed. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, and Huberman. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. 2nd ed. University of Michigan: SAGE Publication.
- Nababan. (1991). *Sosiolinguistik: Suatu pengantar*[Sociolinguistics: An introduction]. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Nattinger, J. R., & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D., and Julie C. (2023). *Clarity and coherence in academic writing*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English Language*. Longman.
- Richard, B. (2006). *The Norton field guide to writing*. United States of America, W. W. Norton & Company.
- Richards, J. C. and Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching; An Anthology of Current Practice*. New York: Pers Universitas Cambridge.
- Rizki, A. (2020). "Learning Language from Others: Language Contacts and Attitudes among Gayo Lues Students in Banda Aceh." 21(1):1–9.
- Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (2014). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Subandowo, D. (2017). The Language Interference in English Speaking." *Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on English Language and Teaching (ISELT-5)* 205–10.
- Sudirman, Anselmus, Adria Vitalya Gemilang, and Thadius Marhendira Adi Kristanto. (2021). The Power of reflective journal writing for university students from the EFL Perspective. *Studies in English Language and Education* 8(3):1061–79. doi: 10.24815/siele.v8i3.19105.
- Swan, M. (2006). *Practical English Usage*. Oxford University Press.
- Syafutri, Tania, and Andri Saputra. 2021. "The First language interference toward students' english speaking as foreign language." *Linguists: Journal Of Linguistics and Language Teaching* 7(1):39. doi: 10.29300/ling.v7i1.4327.

- Watcharapunyawong, Somchai, and Siriluck . (2013). "Thai EFL Students' Writing Errors in Different Text Types: The Interference of the First Language." *English Language Teaching* 6(1):67–78. doi: 10.5539/elt.v6n1p67.
- Whitaker, A. (2009). *Academic Writing Guide: A Step-by Step Guide to Writing Academic Papers*. Slovakia: City University of Seattle.
- Williams, K., Woolliams, M. and Spiro, J. (2020). *Reflective writing*. Red Globe Press.