Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

EXPLORING THE EMERGING NON-STANDARD ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION FEATURES OF L1 JAVANESE AND INDONESIAN SPEAKERS

Octavia Butarbutar[1)], Ekarina[2)]*

[1) & 2)] Department of Applied English Linguistics, Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia

Received on 13 June 2024 / Approved on 27 October 2024

Abstract

This study is concerned with pronunciation features of English learners whose L1 are Indonesian and Javanese. Specifically, the research views these non-standard pronunciation features as innovations by L2 English speakers, not as errors; and considers features of the speaker's multi-linguistic repertoire as equal candidates that may win out and manifest themselves in the speaker's spoken production. Consequently, the objectives of this project are: (i) to describe phonological features found in the non-native (L2) English pronunciation of Indonesian and Javanese native-speakers, and (ii) to determine possible factors that influence the emergence of those non-native phonological features. To do this, the researchers watched a recorded video of international conference presentations available on youtube. Salient non-standard pronunciation features were then noted; this data was then compiled for different speakers and was analyzed to uncover possible factors that influence the emergence of the non-standard pronunciation features. The researchers focused on two non-native features, namely the monophthongization of English diphthongs and the replacement of the consonants /ð/ and /θ/ with the plain /d/ and /t/. It can be concluded that L1 phonology, word spelling and general articulatory factors all play a role in potentially shaping those L2 pronunciation features. The study also uncovers that while there are differences between speakers, individual speakers tend to be constant in their choice of non-standard pronunciation features.
Keywords: Phonology; non-standard pronunciation; L1 transfer; constrastive study

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji fitur pengucapan pelajar bahasa Inggris yang Bahasa ibunya adalah bahasa Indonesia dan Jawa. Secara khusus, penelitian ini memandang fitur pengucapan non-standar sebagai inovasi oleh penutur bahasa Inggris sebagai Bahasa asing, bukan sebagai kesalahan; dan mempertimbangkan keseluruhan repertoar fitur multi-linguistik penutur sebagai kandidat setara yang bisa menang kompetisi dan terkandung dalam produksi lisan penutur. Akibatnya, analisis data yang dilakukan tidak hanya mencakup analisis kontrastif yang melibatkan transfer dari Bahasa ibu, tetapi juga mencakup faktor kognitif lain yang mungkin memengaruhi munculnya pengucapan Bahasa Inggris yang tidak standar. Untuk melakukan hal ini, menonton rekaman video presentasi konferensi internasional yang tersedia di youtube. Ciri-ciri pengucapan non-standar yang menonjol kemudian dicatat dan dibandingkan dengan bahasa Inggris standar; hal ini melibatkan data tentang monoftongisasi diftong bahasa Inggris dan penggantian konsonan /ð/ dan /θ/ dengan konsonan /d/ dan /t/. Data ini dikumpulkan untuk penutur yang berbeda-beda, lalu dianalisis untuk mengungkap kemungkinan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi munculnya ciri-ciri pengucapan non-standar tersebut. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa fonologi Bahasa ibu, frekuensi, ejaan kata, dan faktor artikulasi umum semuanya berperan dalam membentuk ciri-ciri pengucapan non-standar pembicara. Studi ini juga mengungkap bahwa meskipun ada perbedaan antar penutur, masing-masing penutur cenderung konstan dalam memilih fitur pengucapan non-standar mereka.
Kata Kunci: *Fonologi; pengucapan non-standar; transfer Bahasa ibu; studi konstrastif*

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

INTRODUCTION

With the rise of globalization, there is an increased need to communicate with an ever expanding circle of people. To serve this need, English has risen to be the language of choice in the political, financial and cultural spheres. Consequently, there is also a growing number of people who are non-native English speakers who use the language frequently with each other (Crystal, 2003). Considering the global nature of English and how the number of non-native speakers outnumbers the native speakers, it is not enough to consider only the native speaker variety of English as the correct English language, especially since a growing number of non-native speakers mostly use English in the context of international conversation with other non-native speakers. This situation necessitates that other non-native English varieties should not be seen simply as deviations from the standard, but as new emerging varieties in their own right.

When non-native speakers learn a new language, their multilingual repertoires cannot be considered separate entities, and are likely to influence each other, producing language outcomes that might differ from the native language variety. For example, English learners whose native language is Indonesian might transfer some of the linguistic features of Indonesian to their English. For instance, the English produced by Indonesian speakers often have copula omission, a feature that is also present in Indonesian (Sidupa, 2018). Oftentimes, this L1 transfer is just one of many factors that might influence the linguistic characteristics of the resultant foreign language; other factors such as general learning strategies, cognitive processes, and sociolinguistic circumstances can work together in influencing a non-native language variety (Anderwald, 2017). As such, the linguistic characteristics of a non-native language variation can be a new innovation that is influenced, but different from the standard L1 or L2. For instance, Indonesian speakers might overgeneralize the -ed past tense marker in their English, even though Indonesian does not mark the verb for tense (Sidupa, 2018). This is likely the result of a general learning strategy, resulting from the contrast between Indonesian and English.

Building on this view that non-native English features can be seen as the emergence of a new English variety, this study is concerned specifically with exploring the phonological features of the English spoken by Indonesian and Javanese native speakers, taking into account the influence of L1 transfer from both Indonesian and Javanese, as well as other factors like spelling and articulatory ease. Specifically, the following research questions served as guidelines:

1. What are the phonological characteristics of the non-standard English pronunciation amongst Indonesian and Javanese speakers?
2. What are possible factors that might influence some of these non-standard English pronunciation features?

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the formation of new language varieties, including new non-native English varieties, two separate processes are crucial: (a) innovation; and (b) standardization (Van Rooy et al., 2011). New linguistic feature innovations in a new variety are mostly attributed to cognitive and psycholinguistic factors at the individual level, while standardization and conventionalization is a shared social phenomenon at the level of communities. An innovation that is not spread out, standardized and accepted by the community may only be seen as mistakes or errors, as has been studied extensively in the literature on language teaching and second language acquisition (Yeo, et al., 2023; Mitterer, Eger & Reinisch, 2020; Ikhwanur, Khabibah & Saputra, 2021; among others). Crucially, the standardization or acceptance of linguistic innovation in a community is what differentiates new non-native English varieties from learner English. Some markers that a new linguistic innovation has been accepted in a specific community includes widespread use in a community, dispersed use in many areas, inclusion in the educational system and use by prominent

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

figures or authorities (Bamgbose, 1998). The data studied in this project comes from speakers at an academic conference, a sign that the language spoken is somewhat accepted in academia and used by professionals in the field. This satisfies some of the conditions that should be met to signal conventionalization within a speech community, and as such, the researchers treat non-standard linguistic features found in the data recording as features of a new emerging English variety.

Previous research has also looked at pronunciation features of non-native English speakers, especially in the context of communication with other non-native speakers and has claimed that imitating native speaker pronunciation is not the goal, but rather mutual intelligibility (Jenkins 2000; Deterding, 2013; Deterding & Mohamad, 2016). Jenkins (2000) claims that in the use of English as a Lingua Franca, there is a Lingua Franca Core (LFC) that is essential for mutual intelligibility. These features included in the LFC are: (i) all consonants except /θ/, /ð/ and [ɬ]; (ii) vowel length distinctions; (iii) initial consonant clusters; (iv) the mid-central nurse vowels; and (v) nuclear stress. On the other hand, other phonological features can be considered peripheral, not as important for mutual intelligibility and do not need to be the focus of the English teaching repertoire. These features include: (i) The consonants /θ/, /ð/ and [ɬ]; (ii) Final consonant clusters; (iii) Individual vowel quality (apart from NURSE); (iv) Reduced vowels or weak forms; (v) Lexical stress; (vi) Intonational tones; and (vii) Stress-based rhythm. Subsequent research by Deterding (2013), Deterding & Mohamad (2016), among others, supports Jenkins' claim in that they have found misunderstandings happening between non-native speakers only when the features included in the LFC are not properly pronounced. Accordingly, one would expect to find new linguistic features developing strictly from the pool of non-LFC features in new English varieties, because any innovation from the LFC features described are likely to lead to misunderstandings and are therefore, not likely to be widely accepted in the community of speakers. This is also borne out in the data attained in this study, whereby the researchers found the most salient non-standard English pronunciation features to be the diphthongs and the consonants /θ/ and /ð/.

While the LFC can be a good predictor for which phonological features are more likely to be non-standard in L2 English varieties, an investigation into non-standard L2 pronunciation is not complete without delving into possible factors that might influence the outcome of these non-standard L2 pronunciation. One of the most well studied factors that influence L2 pronunciation is the speaker's L1 (Lubua, 2023; Alghazo, 2022, among others). This tradition views speakers' L1 as interference that can affect the outcome of certain linguistic features in the speakers' L2, including pronunciation. To investigate this effect, it is necessary to conduct a careful contrastive study that explores similar linguistic features in the L1 and L2 of specific speakers. As such, a comparative study of features in Indonesian, Javanese and English is done in the Findings and Discussion section below, specifically on features identified as non-native L2 English features produced by the speakers being investigated in this study. Additionally, word spelling also plays an important role in influencing non-native L2 pronunciation, especially for a language like English where there is often a disconnect between word spelling and their pronunciation. Some studies conducted on this issue have uncovered that L2 spelling can hinder target-like L2 acquisition (Basseti & Escudero, 2015; Young-Scholten & Langer, 2015). This is explored in depth later in this article for specific words where the researchers found non-native L2 English pronunciation in the data. Moreover, the speed of speech and assimilation (or ease of articulation) can also influence the pronunciation of both native and non-native English speakers (Vančová, 2019). For example, the /n/ sound in unclear may be pronounced as /ŋ/, while the /n/ sound in unbelievable may be pronounced as /m/ in fast speech. In the case of unclear, the /n/ assimilates in its place of articulation to /k/, resulting in the velar nasal /ŋ/. In the case of unbelievable, the /n/ assimilates in its place of articulation to /b/, resulting in the bilabial nasal /m/. Both cases are examples of regressive assimilation, where the following sound has an effect on its preceding sound (Ortin, 2023; Durvasula & Kahng, 2016). This is shown to also play a role in explaining the non-native speaker pronunciation found in the data below.

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The researchers used a qualitative research framework as the research design in this study. Qualitative research aims to investigate and understand the significance of various aspects of human existence and social contexts (Fossey & Harvey, 2002). Meanwhile, for this study, the researchers selected three speakers as subjects of the study. The researchers chose to analyze speaker utterances from the 2022 International Conference of Multidisciplinary Studies (ICOMSI) held at Universitas Sebelas Maret held in Surakarta. The researchers made this decision based on the known global nature of the conference and the requirement for presenters to use English in their presentations. The unique aspect of this conference was the inclusion of speakers from Central Java, where Javanese is the predominant language spoken, instead of Indonesian. This provided an opportunity for the researchers to explore potential cases of Javanese L1 substrate transfer, a topic that had received less attention in previous studies.

Further, the complete conference recordings were available on YouTube, which served as the source of data for this research. As stated, Indonesian/Javanese speakers were chosen as the research subjects. The researchers watched the chosen video available on YouTube and concentrated on annotating features of non-standard English pronunciation in the talks (the Observe-Note method). Data from the notes were then generalized to uncover shared patterns of non-native L2 English pronunciation among the speakers. These generalized patterns are presented in separate tables in the Findings and Discussion below. Finally, an analysis of the possible factors such as L1 interference, L2 spelling and general articulatory ease that might influence the identified non-standard English pronunciation patterns was conducted.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Patterns of Phonological Innovations in Indonesian English

After analyzing the data, the researchers decided to focus on the following most salient phonological innovations:

1. Varied patterns of diphthong-to-monophthong innovations. The diphthong /aʊ/ is replaced by the monophthongs /o/ or /a/, while the diphthong /eɪ/ is replaced by the monophthong /ɪ/ or /e/, and the diphthong /oʊ/ is consistently produced as the monophthong /o/.
   Several other studies in the context of L1 Indonesian and L2 English speakers have uncovered similar difficulties with L2 English diphthongs (Sulistyaningsih, 2018; Rachman, 2020; Desri, 2016; among others).
2. Pronunciation of both the voiced and voiceless interdental consonants /ð/ and /θ/ as the dental stops /d/ and /t/ respectively.
   Several similar studies have also reported similar difficulties with interdental consonants in L2 English acquisition for Indonesian speakers (Arsanto, et al., 2019; Tambunsaribu & Simatupang, 2020; among others).

Varied patterns of diphthong-to-monophthong innovations

Table 1. Monophthongization of the diphthong /aʊ/

Timestamp	Speaker	Standard English	Indonesian English Innovation	Diphthongs to Monophthong

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

00:34:13	Speaker 1	You know about **əbaʊt** him already	You know about him **abot** already	/aʊ/ to /o/
0:34:28	Speaker 1	Further information about her **əbaut**	Further information about **abot** her	/aʊ/ to /o/
1:22:26	Speaker 1	habitat now have a **naʊ** poor	habitat now have a poor **no**	/aʊ/ to /o/
1:22:08	Speaker 2	also for our future **aʊər**	also for our future **ar**	/aʊ/ to /a/
1:23:16	Speaker 2	nature we are now **naʊ**	nature we are now **na**	/aʊ/ to /a/
1:23:57	Speaker 2	how the small **haʊ** plants how the small **haʊ** animals	how the small plants how **ha** **ha** the small animals	/aʊ/ to /a/
2:25:15	Speaker 3	fashion roll out **aʊt**	fashion roll out **at**	/aʊ/ to /a/

The table above reveals a pattern of diphthong-to-monophthong transformation in the Indonesian English versions. It can be seen that the diphthong /aʊ/ is consistently replaced with the monophthongs /o/ or /a/. This pattern is observed across different words and speakers. However, it can be observed that Speaker 1 consistently produces /o/, while speakers 2 and 3 consistently produce /a/ instead of /aʊ/. From this, it can be seen that individual speakers seem to be consistent in applying the same innovations, suggesting little or no intra-speaker variation. When considering the data amongst different speakers, though, it seems that there is inter-speaker variation.

The data in table 1 also indicates that replacement of /aʊ/ with a monophthong is not restricted to specific words but extends across different lexical items. Just from data in table 1, this innovative process can be seen in words like *about, now, our, how* and *out*. This suggests that even though different speakers may employ different strategies, the pattern is generalizable, affecting various words containing the diphthong /aʊ/.

Table 2. Monophthongization of the diphthong /eɪ/

Timestamp	**Speaker**	**Standard English**	**Indonesian English Innovation**	**Diphthongs to Monophthong**
33:54	Speaker 1	invited speakers today **tədeɪ**	invited speakers today **tədе**	/eɪ/ to /e/

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

1:32:17	Speaker 2	the energy uh they **ðeɪ** come into our Earth	the energy uh they **dɪ** come into our Earth	/eɪ/ to /ɪ/
2:12:13	Speaker 3	the presentation **prɛzənteɪʃən**	the presentation **prɛzənteʃən**	/eɪ/ to /e/
2:25:15	Speaker 3	how to make **meɪk**	how to make **mek**	/eɪ/ to /e/
2:25:52	Speaker 3	Texas at Austin USA **juɛseɪ**	Texas at Austin USA **juɛse**	/eɪ/ to /e/

Similar to the previous table, table 2 shows a pattern of the monophthongization of the diphthong /eɪ/. However, unlike /aʊ/, the diphthong /eɪ/ is consistently replaced by the monophthong /ɪ/. This pattern can be observed across different words as this is done by speakers 1, 2 and 3. Similarly, this happens across different words such as *today, presentation, make and USA*. The only exception seen here is in the case of *they,* whereby speaker 2 produced the vowel /ɪ/ as replacement of /eɪ/.

Table 3. Monophthongization of the diphthong /oʊ/

Timestamp	**Speaker**	**Standard English**	**Indonesian English Innovation**	**Diphthongs to Monophthong**
0:34:30	Speaker 1	So we know better **noʊ**	So we know better **no**	/oʊ/ to /o/
0:34:06	Speaker 1	totally before we start **toʊtəli**	totally before we start **totəli**	/oʊ/ to /o/
34:55	Speaker 1	and rectors in November **noʊvɛmbər**	and rectors in November **novɛmbər**	/oʊ/ to /o/
1:32:35	Speaker 2	ozone also it is **oʊzoʊn**	ozone also it is **ozon**	/oʊ/ to /o/
1:30:59	Speaker 2	biodiversity that doing **baɪoʊdəvɜrsəti** extinction	biodiversity that doing **baɪodəvɜrsəti** extinction	/oʊ/ to /o/
1:23:57	Speaker 2	but how the microorganism **maɪkroʊɔrgənɪzəm**	but how the microorganism **maɪkroɔrgənɪzəm**	/oʊ/ to /o/
2:24:55	Speaker 3	Covid infection **koʊvɪd**	Covid infection **kovɪd**	/oʊ/ to /o/

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

2:25:15	Speaker 3	fashion roll out **roʊl**	fashion roll out **rol**	/oʊ/ to /o/
2:25:22	Speaker 3	okay the second speaker **oʊkeɪ**	okay the second **okeɪ** speaker	/oʊ/ to /o/
2:26:05	Speaker 3	very long bio **baɪoʊ**	very long bio **baɪo**	/oʊ/ to /o/
2:25:15	Speaker 3	fashion roll out **roʊl**	fashion roll out **rol**	/oʊ/ to /o/

Similar to findings shown in tables 1 and 2, table 3 shows a pattern of the monophthongization of the diphthong /oʊ/. The diphthong /oʊ/ shows the most consistent pattern of replacement with /o/ compared to /eɪ/ and /aʊ/. The pattern of standard English /oʊ/ becoming /o/ holds for all speakers, across a varied range of vocabulary items including *roll, bio, okay, covid, ozone*, among others.

Replacement of the Standard English Voiced and Voiceless Dental Fricative Sounds

The research discovered that in Indonesian English, all three participants consistently substituted the voiced dental fricative /ð/ with the voiced dental stop /d/. Likewise, the study revealed a consistent pattern of replacing the voiceless dental fricative /θ/ with the dental stop /t/ in the speech of all three participants.

Table 4. Voiced Dental Fricative /ð/ → /d/

Timestamp	**Number of Speaker**	**Standard English**	**Indonesian English Innovation**
00:33:36	Speaker 1	that we can talk **ðæt**	dat we can talk. **dæt**
1:14:32	Speaker 1	about the problem we are **ðə** facing	about the problem we are **də** facing
1:14:40	Speaker 1	this problem is not **ðɪs**	this problem is not **dɪs**
1:17:11	Speaker 2	so they had um we should **ðeɪ** be very	so they had um we should be **deɪ** very
1:17:21	Speaker 2	what I want to talk about this **ðɪs**	what I want to talk about this **dɪs**

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

1:18:36	Speaker 2	and the ecosystem **ði**	and the ecosystem **di**
1:20:40	Speaker 2	if there is a biodiversity **ðɛr**	if there is a biodiversity **dɛr**
2:12:54	Speaker 3	that the internet **ðæt ði** connection	that the internet connection **dæt di**

Table 4 presents examples found in the video recording of how the standard English /ð/ becomes /d/ across all speakers and vocabulary items. Similarly, table 5 below presents examples of how the standard English /θ/ becomes /t/ regardless of speaker or vocabulary item.

Table 5. Voiceless Dental Fricative /θ/ → /t/

Timestamp	Number of Speaker	Standard English	Indonesian English Innovation
00:34:07	Speaker 1	With professor **wɪθ**	Wit professor **wɪt**
1:15:06	Speaker 1	nature thank you very **θæŋk** much	nature thank you very much **tæŋk**
1:15:06	Speaker 1	friends uh and our third **θɜrd**	friends uh and our third **tɜrd**
1:18:13	Speaker 2	is so all the things they **θɪŋz**	is so all the things they **tɪŋz**
1:18:15	Speaker 2	and the third levels **θɜrd**	and the third levels **tɜrd**
2:12:52	Speaker 3	using the zoom method **mɛθəd**	using the zoom method **mɛtəd**
2:12:39	Speaker 3	With professor **wɪθ**	With professor **wɪt**

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

Factors influencing the identified emerging pronunciation features

a. L1 interference

Much research has shown and argued that L1 transfer is one of the most important influences on 'accents' in the L2 (Kartushina & Frauenfelder, 2014; Vaughn, 2019). As such, it is important to consider the contrastive analysis of English and Indonesian, as well as Javanese to try to explain the data obtained. Both the voiced and voiceless interdental /ð/ and /θ/ consonants are not part of either Indonesian or Javanese sound inventory. Accordingly, previous research has reported that both consonants present a certain level of difficulty for Indonesian or Javanese speakers (Arsanto, et al., 2019). In Jenkins' (2000) Lingua Franca Core (LFC), both consonants are also listed as not being part of the LFC, and consequently, their exact articulation is typically unimportant for mutual intelligibility amongst non-native speakers. The closest consonants in both manner and place of articulation in Indonesian is the voiced and voiceless consonants /t/ and /d/, and also their retroflex counterparts in Javanese: / [ʈ] and [ɖ] (Kusuma & Kurniati, 2020). Presented with the option of the plain stops and the retroflex version, it seems that speakers in the video observed in this study chose the Indonesian plain stops /d/ and /t/. This is not surprising given the formal nature of the conference event. Previous study has indicated that even though Javanese is a language with many speakers, it cannot be categorized as "safe" from endangerment, largely due to a shift in its intergenerational transmission. Specifically, it has been reported that there is an expansion of Indonesian usage amongst the younger generation, especially in situations where the Krama or polite form of Javanese were used (Cohn & Ravindranath, 2014). As such, it follows that in a formal conference, such as the one observed in the video, the Indonesian variants /d/ and /t/ would win out against the Javanese retroflex variants.

On the other hand, the case with diphthong monophthongization is not as clear cut. While both consonants /ð/ and /θ/ are not present either in Indonesian or Javanese, both Indonesian and Javanese have diphthongs in their sound inventory. Depending on the English variety, there are about 10-12 diphthong sounds. In contrast, in Indonesian, there are only 3 common diphthong sounds:

1. /aɪ / as in *damai*
2. /ɔɪ/ as in *sekoi*
3. /aʊ/ as in *danau*

The diphthong sound /eɪ/ is only used in loanwords such as *survei.* Meanwhile, Javanese is reported to have at least 5 diphthong sounds (Marsono as cited in Widagsa, 2017):

1. /uɪ/ as in cuilik 'very small'
2. /ua/ as in uadoh 'very far'
3. /ue/ as in ngueyel 'very stubborn'
4. /uə/ as in guedhe 'very big'
5. /uɔ/ as in luara 'very painful'

Out of all the diphthongs considered in the results section, /oʊ/ does not exist in either Javanese or Indonesian. However, /aʊ/ and marginally /eɪ/ is part of the Indonesian sound inventory. For both Indonesian and Javanese, though, diphthongs in general are much more marginal than their counterparts in English. In Javanese, for example, the use of diphthongs is marked only for cases of exaggeration. In Indonesian, diphthongs are often monophthongized in colloquial speech. For example *damai* may be colloquially pronounced as *dame,* and *danau* may be colloquially pronounced as *dano (*Widagsa, 2017). In both Indonesian and Javanese, diphthongs also mostly appear only in open syllables, or syllables with no coda. This is further phonotactic restriction that does not exist in English, as diphthongs may also appear in closed syllables, such as in *about.* This

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

also shows that the effect of L1 transfer on L2 pronunciation does not only depend on the availability of certain sounds in the L1, but also on the frequency and phonotactics involving those sounds.

These additional factors might play a role in the general monophthongization of English diphthongs in the data. At the same time, Jenkins' (2000) also states that vowel sounds apart from vowel length distinction and the nurse vowels do not belong to the Lingua Franca Core (LFC) and thus, mutual intelligibility is not dependent on the exact qualities of individual vowels, including diphthongs. The outcomes of the diphthong monophthongization explained in the results section can be attributed to different factors. First, there is a strong tendency for speakers to choose the first vowel in a diphthong as replacement for that specific diphthong. As a result, /oʊ/ is consistently pronounced as /o/, /eɪ/ is overwhelmingly pronounced as /e/, and the majority of speakers (speakers 2 and 3) pronounce /aʊ/ as /a/. Variations amongst the innovative outcome of the same diphthong may be further influenced by: (i) the word spelling; and (ii) other general articulatory ease.

b. L2 word spelling influence

The influence of spelling on non-native English pronunciation among Indonesian and Javanese speakers is apparent. For example, in words like *know and bio* the 'o' represents the diphthong /oʊ/ sound, so the spelling coincides with the first sound in the diphthong. Since there is a tendency for diphthongs to be pronounced as just the first vowel sound, the outcome seen in *know* and *bio* in table 3 is expected; there is no competition between the spelling and the first vowel in the diphthong. Consequently, because the spelling of all the words listed in table 3 above contains the letter 'o,' replacement of /oʊ/ with /o/ is consistent; there is no exception. However, the case is different from the data in table 1. In table one, the diphthong /aʊ/ starts with the /a/ sound, yet the spelling of the words in table 1 does not contain the letter 'a.' Instead, there are words spelled with 'o' or 'ou,' as seen in *now, about, how, out and our.* This means that speakers are presented with 2 competing choices of pronouncing the words: (i) following the spelling with the /o/ sound; or (ii) following the first sound of the actual diphthong /a/. Data in table 1 shows a difference in individual choice, whereby option (i) wins out in speaker 1, resulting in the pronunciation of *about* with the /o/ sound. On the other hand, option (ii) wins out in speakers 2 and 3, resulting in the pronunciation of *how and out* with the /a/ sound. From this, it can be seen that spelling of individual words may play an important role in determining the vowel sound that different speakers choose to pronounce (Khansir & Tajeri, 2015; Martin, 2017; Loukin, 2015).

c. General articulatory ease

While spelling can play a role in shaping non-native English pronunciation, it is not the sole determining factor (Dewi et al., 2019). For instance, the variation in pronouncing *they* with /ɪ/ and *presentation* with /e/ does not seem to be influenced by spelling. The case of *they* pronounced with the vowel sound /ɪ/ presents the only exception in the data from table 2, whereby the diphthong /eɪ/ is pronounced as /ɪ/. Other words in table 2 follows the expected outcome of the diphthong /eɪ/ being pronounced as the first sound /e/, even in words where there is a mismatch between the expected /e/ and the letter used in the writing (such as *presentation,* where the /eɪ/ sound is represented with 'a' in the spelling). When considering this exceptional case, *they* is spelled with the letter /e/, which actually coincides with the expected outcome of /e/ sound for the diphthong /eɪ/. As such, this outcome is a puzzle, if only the spelling of the word is considered. However, general articulatory ease may be used to explain this. Coming back to the example of *they* from table 2, considering the environment in which the word is said, namely the sentence: the energy uh they come into our Earth [**ðeɪ** ˈɛnərʤ**i** ʌ **ðɪ** ….], it is possible to deduce that the speaker might have applied assimilation where the vowel in *they* assimilates to the preceding vowel sound /i/ found in

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

the preceding words *the* and *energy*. Thus, there is a case found in the data where ease of articulation, in the form of assimilation, can be used to explain the outcome.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

This exploration of some characteristics in the emerging new English variety in Indonesia has uncovered 2 general patterns:

1. Monophthongization of diphthongs
2. Replacement of standard English voiced and voiceless interdentals /ð/ and /θ/ with the plain dental stops /d/ and /t/ respectively.

This discovery is not surprising, as both patterns involve linguistic features outside of the Lingua Franca Core (LFC), and are thus, not deemed essential for mutual intelligibility. The patterns reported in the results section are influenced by many factors including L1 interference, L2 word spelling and ease of articulation. In the discussion of L1 influence, the researchers have additionally discussed the availability of certain L2 sounds in the L1, but also the frequency, sociolinguistics and phonotactics of those sounds in the L1, as important contributing factors in determining the outcome of the new L2 English innovations seen in the data.

It is important to note, that while the observed patterns for /ð/ and /θ/ are constant for all speakers, monophthongization of diphthongs is quite variable. For speaker 2, for example, there are cases where the word they is pronounced with the diphthong /eɪ/ (See Table 4). However, this is also not surprising, as Jenkins (2000) have also noted that even for those phonological features included in the Lingua Franca Core (LFC), that are crucial for intelligibility, non-native speakers are not always accurate all the time. Consequently, variations in the pronunciation on non-core LFC features such as diphthongs are expected to show even more variability.

Suggestions

To build a more comprehensive description of this new emerging English variety in Indonesia, future research needs to explore other linguistic domains such as syntax, semantics and pragmatics.

NOTES

This paper was also presented orally at KOLITA 22 held in Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia. The authors would like to thank the audience and reviewers for their helpful feedback. The authors also appreciate the anonymous feedback received from reviewers in this journal.

REFERENCES

Alghazo, S. M. (2022). *A*cquiring L2 Phonology: Foreign Accent and L1 Influence. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 12(6), 396–410.

Anderwald, L. (2017). World Englishes and dialectology. *The Oxford handbook of world Englishes*, 252.

Arsanto, A. Y., Prawinanto, A., & Bram, B. (2019). Interdental Consonant Sound Errors Made by First Semester Students of English Education of Sanata Dharma University. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, *8*(2), 118-132.

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

Bamgbose, A. (1998). Torn between the norms: Innovations in world Englishes. *World englishes*, *17*(1).

Bassetti, B., Escudero, P., & Hayes-Harb, R. (2015). Second language phonology at the interface between acoustic and orthographic input. *Applied psycholinguistics*, *36*(1), 1-6.

Cohn, A. C., & Ravindranath, M. (2014). Local languages in Indonesia: Language maintenance or language shift. *Linguistik Indonesia*, *32*(2), 131-148.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge university press.

Desri, A. (2016). The diphthongs: The obstacles for Indonesian speakers of English. *Lingua Cultura*, 3(2), 55–63.

Deterding, D. (2013). *Misunderstandings in English as a lingua franca: An analysis of ELF interactions in South-East Asia* (Vol. 1). Walter de Gruyter.

Deterding, D., & Mohamad, N. R. (2016). The lingua franca core and Englishes in East and Southeast Asia. *Asiatic: IIUM Journal of English Language and Literature*, *10*(2).

Dewi, R., Utami, P. T., & Hasanah, N. (2019). The Influence of L1 Phonological and Orthographic System in L2 Pronunciation: a Study of Brebes Javanese Learners of English. In *Fifth Prasasti International Seminar on Linguistics (PRASASTI 2019)* (pp. 221-229). Atlantis Press.

Durvasula, K., & Kahng, J. (2016). The role of phrasal phonology in speech perception: What perceptual epenthesis shows us. *Journal of phonetics*, *54*, 15-34.

Ikhwanur, A., Khabibah, I., & Saputra, V. W. (2021). Errors in English pronunciation made by students of Esa Unggul University. *Proceedings of the SNIP Conference*, 281–290.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2000. The Phonology of English as an International Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kartushina, N., & Frauenfelder, U. H. (2014). On the effects of L2 perception and of individual differences in L1 production on L2 pronunciation. *Frontiers in psychology*, *5*, 105122.

Khansir, A. A., & Tajeri, M. (2015). The relationship between spelling and pronunciation in English language. *Language in India*, *15*(12), 57-69.

Kusuma, Adhi. & Kurniati, Victa Sari Dwi. (2020). A Comparative Study of English and Javanese Sound Inventories. *Tamansiswa International Journal in Education and Science (TIJES)*, Vol 2 (No. 1), Page 31-35.

Lubua, F. G. (2023). Interference in Acquisition of Phonology by Swahili-Speaking EFL Learners. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 14(33), 24–35.

Martin, K. I. (2017). The impact of L1 writing system on ESL knowledge of vowel and consonant spellings. *Reading and Writing*, *30*, 279-298.

Mitterer, H., Eger, N. A., & Reinisch, E. (2020). My English sounds better than yours: Second-language learners perceive their own accent as better than that of their peers. *PLOS ONE, 15*(1), e0227643.

Ortín, R. (2023). ENGL6360 Descriptive Linguistics for Teachers.

Rachman, R. A. (2020). Students' problems in pronouncing non-existing English diphthongs in Indonesian language. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 15(1), 15–24.

Sidupa, C. (2018). Indonesian Language Transfer of Students of English as a Second Language (ESL). *KnE Social Sciences*, 51-57.

Sulistyaningsih, N. (2018). English diphthongs [eɪ], [aɪ], [aʊ] pronunciation problems encountered by seventh-semester students of English literature study program in Stikubank University academic year of 2018. *Journal of Linguistics and Literature Studies*, 10(2), 101–110.

Tambunsaribu, G., & Simatupang, M. S. (2020). Pronunciation Problems Faced by Indonesian College Students Who Learn to Speak English. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine*, 7(8), 2580–2589.

Van Rooy, B., Mukherjee, J., & Hundt, M. (2011). A principled distinction between error and conventionalized innovation in African Englishes. *Exploring second-language varieties of English and learner Englishes*, *44*, 189-207.

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]

Journal of English Language and Culture *Vol. 15 (No. 1) : 16 – 28. Th. 2024*
Versi Online: http://journal.ubm.ac.id/index.php/english-language-culture *p-ISSN: 2087-8346*
Hasil Penelitian *e-ISSN: 2597-8896*

Vančová, H. (2019). Current issues in pronunciation teaching to non-native learners of English. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*, *7*(2), 140-155.

Vaughn, C., Baese-Berk, M., & Idemaru, K. (2019). Re-examining phonetic variability in native and non-native speech. *Phonetica*, *76*(5), 327-358.

Widagsa, R. (2017). Closing Diphthongs among Javanese Learners of English. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, *2*(2), 1-10.

Yeo, E. J., Ryu, H., Lee, J., Kim, S., & Chung, M. (2023). Comparison of L2 Korean pronunciation error patterns from five L1 backgrounds by using automatic phonetic transcription. *Journal of Korean Linguistics, 28*(3), 345–367.

Young-Scholten, M., & Langer, M. (2015). The Role of Orthographic Input in L2 German: Evidence from Naturalistic Adult Learners' Production. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 36(1), 93–114.

*Author(s) Correspondence:
E-mail: octavia.202200010014@student.atmajaya.ac.id[1)], ekarina.winarto@atmajaya.ac.id[2)]