



A TEACHER'S PERCEPTION OF INTRALINGUAL INTERFERENCE IN EFL SPEAKING: A NARRATIVE INQUIRY FROM A REMOTE ISLAND SCHOOL IN MADURA, INDONESIA

Ach Fauzi¹⁾

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

¹ achfauzi.2024@student.uny.ac.id

Histori artikel

Received:
9 June 2026

Accepted:
26 June 2026

Published:
26 June 2026

Abstrak

Interferensi intrabahasa dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing (EFL) masih menjadi tantangan yang sering muncul, namun kajian yang berfokus pada persepsi guru di konteks daerah terpencil masih terbatas. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji persepsi seorang guru EFL berpengalaman terhadap interferensi intrabahasa dalam keterampilan berbicara siswa di sebuah sekolah menengah negeri di Pulau Gili Genting, Madura. Penelitian ini menggunakan narrative inquiry dengan data yang diperoleh melalui wawancara semi-terstruktur terhadap seorang guru bahasa Inggris perempuan (T1) yang berpengalaman lima tahun mengajar di sekolah tersebut. Data dianalisis menggunakan analisis tematik. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa guru mengidentifikasi empat bentuk utama interferensi intrabahasa, yaitu grammatical overgeneralisation, phonological substitution, lexical confusion, dan unsystematic code-switching. Pola-pola ini dipahami berkaitan dengan keterbatasan penguasaan bahasa Inggris siswa serta faktor sosiokultural, khususnya budaya Madura yang memengaruhi norma kesantunan, hierarki sosial, dan identitas budaya. Guru juga menilai bahwa faktor tersebut berkontribusi terhadap kecemasan berkomunikasi serta penggunaan strategi tutur tidak langsung dalam bahasa Inggris. Untuk mengatasi hal tersebut, guru menekankan pentingnya pedagogi berbasis budaya, latihan fonologis terarah, dan guided translanguaging. Temuan ini menegaskan pentingnya perspektif guru dalam memahami interferensi intrabahasa di konteks pembelajaran EFL yang memiliki karakteristik geografis dan budaya tertentu, serta perlunya pengembangan profesional guru yang lebih responsif terhadap konteks lokal.

Kata-kata Kunci: kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris, identitas budaya, interferensi intralingual, sekolah pulau terpencil, translanguaging

*Penulis koresponding : Ach Fauzi (achfauzi.2024@student.uny.ac.id)

Abstract. Intralingual interference, which refers to errors originating from the target language system itself rather than the learners' first language, remains a persistent challenge in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning. However, studies examining how teachers in remote and resource-limited contexts perceive this phenomenon are still limited. This study aims to investigate an experienced EFL teacher's perception of intralingual interference in students' speaking performance at a public secondary school in Gili Genting Island, Madura, Indonesia. The study employed a narrative inquiry design. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with a female English teacher (T1), a native speaker of Madurese with five years of teaching experience at the school. The data were analyzed using thematic analysis. The findings reveal that T1 identified four dominant forms of intralingual interference in students' English speech, namely grammatical overgeneralization, phonological substitution, lexical confusion, and unsystematic code-switching. According to the teacher, these patterns are linked to students' limited mastery of English forms and are influenced by sociocultural factors, particularly Madurese cultural identity, including social hierarchy norms, politeness, and cultural pride. T1 also perceived that these factors contribute to communication anxiety and the tendency to use indirect speech strategies in English communication. To address these challenges, the teacher highlighted culturally responsive pedagogy, targeted phonological practice, and guided translanguaging as useful classroom approaches. The study emphasizes the importance of teachers' perspectives in understanding EFL learning challenges in geographically marginalized and culturally distinctive contexts, and highlights the need for culturally responsive teacher professional development.

Keywords: cultural identity, EFL speaking, intralingual interference, remote island school, translanguaging

Introduction

EFL speaking proficiency remains a central concern in applied linguistics given its complexity as a productive skill (Nasiri & Gilakjani, 2016). Beyond the mastery of phonology, grammar, and vocabulary, speaking requires learners to deploy language spontaneously and appropriately within specific social contexts (Armilah et al., 2024). In multilingual settings such as Indonesia, where learners navigate a regional vernacular, Bahasa Indonesia, and English simultaneously, these demands are further compounded by interference across their linguistic repertoire.

One comparatively under-examined type is intralingual interference, referring to errors arising within the target language system itself rather than from L1 transfer (Richards, 1971). It manifests when learners over-extend or misapply target-language rules, particularly under the time pressure of spontaneous speech. While interlingual interference has received substantial empirical attention in Indonesian EFL research (Luh et al., 2024; Rahman et al., 2020), intralingual sources of speaking error remain comparatively neglected, particularly in studies that attend to the sociocultural dimensions of EFL learning.

Cultural identity constitutes one such sociocultural dimension. Scholars have established that learners do not arrive at the EFL classroom as linguistically neutral agents; rather, they carry with them culturally embedded communicative norms, value systems, and identity orientations that shape how they engage with the target language (Kramsch, 1998; Masangcay, 2022). In the Madurese context specifically, social hierarchy, politeness registers (enggi bhunten, enggi enten, enja' iyeh), and norms of indirect expression have been

documented as salient features of communicative behaviour (Anwari et al., 2020; Fajariyah, 2020; Mudhar et al., 2024). How these cultural imperatives interact with intralingual interference in EFL speaking, and how teachers perceive and respond to this interaction, has not been examined in published research.

This gap is particularly significant in the context of remote island communities such as Gili Genting, an island in Sumenep Regency, Madura, East Java. Schools in such settings face structural constraints, limited access to native-speaker input, shortage of authentic English materials, and reduced opportunities for out-of-class English use (Fauzi et al., 2026), that are likely to amplify intralingual error patterns and constrain remediation. Teachers in these contexts thus occupy a critical epistemic position: their sustained, context-specific observations of learner behaviour constitute a valuable, largely untapped source of insight into how intralingual interference operates at the intersection of language, culture, and geography.

The present study addresses this gap by examining the perceptions of a single experienced EFL teacher at one of schools regarding intralingual interference in her students' spoken English. The specific research questions guiding the inquiry are:

- RQ1. What forms of intralingual interference does the teacher perceive as most prevalent in her students' EFL speaking?
- RQ2. How does the teacher perceive Madurese cultural identity as influencing these patterns of intralingual interference?
- RQ3. What pedagogical strategies does the teacher identify as effective in addressing intralingual interference in this context?

By centring teacher perception as the unit of analysis, this study contributes to the literature on EFL in geographically and culturally marginalised communities, and to broader discussions of how local cultural knowledge can be mobilised in language pedagogy.

Method

Pada bagian metode, menuliskan jenis penelitian yang dilakukan. Metode penelitian juga harus menyertakan populasi/sampel atau subjek penelitian, prosedur dan instrumen pengumpulan data, dan analisis data yang dilakukan. Jika tulisan berupa kajian teoritis, pada bagian ini dituliskan bagaimana metode penulisan, misalnya telaah pustaka, literature review, atau sejenisnya.

Research Design

This study employs a narrative inquiry design (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), a qualitative approach that treats experience as the foundational phenomenon of inquiry and attends to the stories through which individuals make sense of their professional lives.

Narrative inquiry was selected on the grounds that the study foregrounds a single teacher's perception, her sustained interpretive account of a specific pedagogical phenomenon across five years of teaching in a particular community. This design is consistent with a growing body of work that positions individual teacher narratives as legitimate and theoretically generative sources of insight in applied linguistics research.

Research Context

The study was conducted in the context of one of schools, a state senior secondary school located on Gili Genting Island in the Sumenep Regency of Madura, East Java Province, Indonesia. As a geographically isolated community, the island exhibits a high degree of cultural and linguistic homogeneity: the vast majority of the population is ethnically Madurese, speaks Madurese as the primary home language, uses Bahasa Indonesia as the language of formal education, and has very limited exposure to English outside the school context. These conditions, strong L1 cultural identity, limited authentic English input, and absence of English use in the immediate community, constitute a distinctive EFL learning environment that has received no prior scholarly attention.

Participant

The study involved one participant, referred to as T1 in accordance with the anonymisation protocol. T1 is a female EFL teacher who has taught English at one of schools for five years at the time of the interview. She is a native Madurese speaker, born and raised in the Sumenep region, and thus possesses insider knowledge of both the cultural context in which her students are embedded and the linguistic characteristics of the Madurese language that may bear on their English acquisition. T1 was selected through purposive sampling on the basis of her sustained experience in the specific research context, her ethnolinguistic insider status, and her willingness to participate. Informed consent was obtained prior to the interview, and anonymisation was agreed upon to protect her professional privacy.

Data Collection

Data were collected through a single semi-structured interview conducted via the Zoom video-conferencing platform. The semi-structured format was adopted to allow for both thematic consistency across predefined question domains and the flexibility to pursue emergent lines of enquiry as the interview progressed (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). The interview covered four thematic domains: (a) T1's general observations of her students' spoken English proficiency and error patterns; (b) her perceptions of the forms and sources of intralingual interference she observed; (c) her understanding of how Madurese cultural identity

and communicative norms shaped her students' EFL speaking behaviour; and (d) the pedagogical strategies she employed or considered effective in addressing intralingual interference.

The interview was conducted in a mixture of English, Indonesian, and Madurese to ensure that T1 could express nuanced observations in the language most natural to her, thereby minimising the risk of expression being constrained by her own English proficiency in the metalinguistic register. The interview was audio-recorded with T1's consent. The interview lasted approximately 60 minutes.

Data Analysis

The contemporaneous transcription data were analysed using Braun & Clarke (2006) six-phase thematic analysis framework, implemented in a theoretically informed manner. The conceptual frameworks of intralingual interference (Richards, 1971), translanguaging (García & Wei, 2014), cultural identity (Norton, 2013), and language anxiety (Horwitz et al., 1986) guiding the interpretive process while remaining open to participant-generated framings.

To strengthen the credibility of the analysis, the researcher maintained a reflective journal throughout the analytical process, documenting interpretive decisions and their theoretical rationale. Member checking was not possible given the unavailability of T1 for follow-up contact at the time of writing. Transferability is addressed through a rich, contextualised description of the research setting and participant background (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Positionality

The first author is himself a Madurese-speaking EFL practitioner who has teaching experience in the region and a personal familiarity with the cultural and educational dynamics of the Madura context. This insider positionality affords interpretive sensitivity to the cultural dimensions of T1's account but also introduces the risk of confirmatory reading. This risk was mitigated through ongoing reflexive scrutiny and the use of verbatim quotations to ground interpretive claims in the participant's own words.

Results

Thematic analysis of T1's interview yielded three overarching themes: (1) perceived forms of intralingual interference in students' spoken English; (2) the role of Madurese cultural identity in shaping interference patterns; and (3) teacher-identified pedagogical strategies for addressing interference. These themes are presented in turn below, with verbatim quotations from T1 used to anchor and illustrate the thematic findings.

Perceived Forms of Intralingual Interference

T1 identified four distinct forms of intralingual interference as recurring features of her students' spoken English. These were grammatical overgeneralisation, phonological substitution, lexical confusion, and unsystematic code-switching.

Regarding grammatical overgeneralisation, T1 consistently noted her students' tendency to use the simple present tense as a default temporal form irrespective of the time reference intended. She described observing her students regularly producing utterances such as: "I go to school yesterday" (T1, describing a typical student utterance)

T1 interpreted this pattern as arising from insufficient internalisation of the English tense system rather than from L1 transfer, noting that Madurese verb morphology does not mark tense inflectionally and that students had learned the simple present as their primary and most practised English verb form. She characterised this as the most pervasive form of interference she observed across all year levels.

With respect to phonological substitution, T1 reported that her students consistently substituted the English dental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ with their nearest alveolar stop equivalents. She described students pronouncing "think" as "tink" and "this" as "dis", attributing these substitutions to the absence of dental fricatives in both Madurese and Indonesian phonological inventories. T1 noted that students were not always aware of these substitutions and that self-correction was rare without explicit prompting.

T1 also identified lexical confusion as a salient interference pattern. The most illustrative case she described concerned the English verbs "borrow" and "lend", which Indonesian speakers frequently conflate due to the undifferentiated Indonesian verb *pinjam*. She reported students regularly producing: "Can you borrow me your book?" (T1, describing a typical student utterance).

T1 attributed this confusion to students' habit of mentally translating from Indonesian when searching for lexical items under time pressure, noting that semantic distinctions that are grammatically marked in English are often unspecified in both Indonesian and Madurese.

Finally, T1 described a pattern of unsystematic code-switching into Madurese or Indonesian when students encountered vocabulary or structural gaps in their English. She provided the example: "I very like nonton film" (T1, describing a typical student utterance)

T1 observed that such mixed-language utterances were most frequent in spontaneous communicative activities such as pair discussions and group debates, where the processing demands precluded careful pre-formulation. She characterised this pattern as qualitatively distinct from deliberate translanguaging, describing it as driven by communicative urgency rather than strategic repertoire use.

The Role of Madurese Cultural Identity

T1 offered rich and detailed reflections on the ways in which Madurese cultural identity, as she perceived it, shaped her students' EFL speaking behaviour. Three sub-themes emerged from this dimension of her account: cultural pride and translanguaging, social norms and communicative anxiety, and cultural value influence on directness.

On the relationship between cultural pride and translanguaging, T1 described students' strong identification with Madurese cultural concepts as motivating the incorporation of culturally specific terminology into their English speech. She noted that students with strong cultural identification would attempt to express concepts such as *kerrabhan sapeh* (*karapan sapi*), a traditional bull racing tradition from Madura Island, East Java, where a pair of bulls pulls a wooden cart controlled by a jockey, in English, often producing structurally incomplete or grammatically erroneous utterances. She described a student producing: "I want to join *kerrabhan sapeh* with my family" (T1, describing a student's utterance during a speaking activity).

T1 interpreted this as reflecting a genuine desire to assert cultural identity rather than a misunderstanding of the concept, but observed that students lacked the linguistic resources to express culturally specific concepts accurately in English. She noted that this pattern could be pedagogically productive if channelled appropriately.

Regarding social norms and communicative anxiety, T1 provided an extended account of the anxiety she perceived in her students when required to speak English in front of peers or in contexts that evoked evaluation. She attributed this anxiety in part to the deeply embedded Madurese social hierarchy and politeness register system, in which the choice of linguistic form carries significant social weight. T1 observed that this cultural imperative translated into English-speaking contexts as a generalised fear of making errors in front of an audience, resulting in students opting for simplified or indirect constructions. She described students avoiding direct refusals and instead producing: "Maybe I not want" (T1, describing a student's attempt to express disagreement).

T1 interpreted this as an instance in which cultural norms of indirectness and face-preservation interacted with intralingual interference: the student was simultaneously avoiding direct negation for cultural reasons and producing a grammatically deviant form due to insufficient command of English negation structures.

On the influence of cultural values on directness, T1 further observed that students systematically avoided direct or assertive speech acts, preferring vague or hedged expressions even in contexts where directness would be communicatively appropriate. She

described students using formulaic hedges such as: "I not sure" (T1, describing a student's attempt to express polite disagreement).

T1 noted that such expressions served a dual function: they indexed the Madurese cultural value of subtlety and non-confrontation while simultaneously reflecting the student's limited command of English negation and modal structures.

Teacher-Identified Pedagogical Strategies

T1 identified three categories of pedagogical strategy she considered effective in addressing intralingual interference in her specific context: culture-responsive teaching, targeted phonological drilling, and guided translanguaging.

With respect to culture-responsive teaching, T1 described integrating Madurese cultural materials, including local folklore, into English lessons as a means of reducing affective barriers to speaking and building a bridge between students' cultural knowledge and the demands of English production. She perceived this approach as effective in reducing anxiety and increasing student engagement, noting that students were more willing to take linguistic risks when the content was culturally familiar.

On targeted phonological drilling, T1 described employing explicit, repeated practice activities focused specifically on the dental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/, presenting these as phonemes that required deliberate articulatory effort given their absence from Madurese and Indonesian. She observed that students required sustained and repeated exposure to these sounds, and that minimal pair drills and shadowing activities produced gradual but noticeable improvement.

Regarding guided translanguaging, T1 described a practice in which she explicitly invited students to translate culturally specific Madurese concepts into English as a scaffolded speaking task, thereby transforming what might otherwise be a source of interference into a structured learning activity. She described asking students to explain kerrabhan sapeh in English, defining it as a traditional bull racing tradition, where a pair of bulls pull a wooden cart controlled by a jockey, as an example of this approach. She perceived this as effective because it validated students' cultural knowledge while simultaneously requiring them to develop the English resources needed to express complex concepts accurately.

T1 also acknowledged the limitations of student-initiated self-study strategies such as vocabulary list-keeping and peer practice, observing that these approaches, while common, were largely unsystematic and of limited effectiveness in the absence of sustained teacher guidance.

Discussion

The findings of this study illuminate the situated, intersecting dimensions of intralingual interference as perceived by an experienced EFL teacher in a geographically isolated and culturally cohesive Madurese community. Considered against the extant literature, T1's perceptions are both consonant with established theoretical accounts and generative of context-specific insights that extend prior work in several directions.

T1's identification of grammatical overgeneralisation as the most prevalent form of intralingual interference in her students' spoken English aligns closely with Richards' (1971) foundational account of developmental error sources in L2 acquisition and with the broader body of evidence documenting tense overgeneralisation in EFL learners across typologically diverse L1 backgrounds. The specific manifestation T1 describes, invariant use of the simple present tense across past, present, and future temporal contexts, is consistent with Selinker's (1972) account of fossilisation in interlanguage development, and reflects the high-frequency, early-instruction profile of the present simple in Indonesian EFL curricula. T1's interpretation of this pattern as reflecting insufficient internalisation rather than L1 transfer is theoretically significant: it positions the error as a problem of target-language rule application rather than cross-linguistic interference, foregrounding the intralingual rather than the interlingual dimension of the learner's difficulty.

The phonological substitution patterns T1 describes, /θ/→[t] and /ð/→[d], are well documented in the literature on Indonesian EFL pronunciation and are consistent with the principle of constrained phonology, according to which learners systematically replace target-language phonemes absent from their L1 inventory with the nearest available approximants (Luh et al., 2024; Onwochei & Bako, 2024). T1's observation that students were often unaware of these substitutions and that self-correction was rare without explicit prompting is consistent with research demonstrating that phonological fossilisation is particularly resistant to incidental correction and requires systematic, form-focused intervention (Amanda et al., 2023). The remote island context adds a dimension largely absent from the existing phonological literature: in Gili Genting, students have minimal access to native-speaker models outside of classroom materials, a condition that is likely to impede the formation of accurate phonological representations and perpetuate substitution patterns. This is aligned with Fauzi (2026) who studied drama teaching in a Madurese English classroom and found a lack of resources, which has relations for the present study.

The lexical confusion T1 describes, specifically, the conflation of "borrow" and "lend" arising from the undifferentiated Indonesian *pinjam*, illustrates the broader principle that semantic interference can operate in a fundamentally intralingual mode even when its origin lies partly in the structural organisation of the learner's L1 (Richards & Schmidt, 2011). The

error is not a direct L1 transfer in the sense of inserting an Indonesian word; rather, it is a mismatch between the learner's acquired target-language lexical representation and the full semantic range the English word requires. This is consistent with research documenting persistent lexical confusion in Indonesian EFL learners in contexts of limited authentic communicative exposure (Octaviana, 2019), and underscores the importance of vocabulary instruction that foregrounds semantic contrast rather than simple translation equivalence.

T1's account of unsystematic code-switching as a form of interference extends the translanguaging literature in an important direction. While (Garcia & Wei, 2015) and Cenoz & Gorter (2021, 2022) have emphasised the value of strategic multilingual repertoire use, T1's account draws a necessary distinction between deliberate pedagogical translanguaging and anxiety-driven code-mixing. Her observation that unsystematic mixed-language production was most frequent during spontaneous communicative activities is consistent with the processing demands literature, which shows that production errors increase when planning time is reduced (Abdi Tabari, 2021; Rostamian et al., 2018). This finding points to the importance of distinguishing translanguaging as a pedagogical resource from code-mixing as a symptom of intralingual difficulty.

T1's perceptions of the role of Madurese cultural identity in shaping interference patterns constitute perhaps the most contextually distinctive contribution of this study. Her account of how cultural pride motivates the attempted incorporation of culturally specific concepts such as *kerrabhan sapeh* (*karapan sapi*/traditional cow/bull race) into English speech, producing structurally deviant but culturally meaningful utterances, confirms the theoretical position that identity expression is a powerful motivating force in L2 production (Norton, 2013), while simultaneously demonstrating that this force can generate intralingual interference when learners lack the target-language resources to express complex cultural concepts accurately. It suggests that culturally loaded topics can serve as productive triggers for speaking activity but require explicit linguistic scaffolding to prevent interference from obstructing communicative intention.

The anxiety dynamics T1 describes are interpretable within Horwitz et al.'s (1986) framework of foreign language anxiety, but carry a culturally specific dimension that the original framework does not capture. T1's account suggests that in the Madurese context, anxiety is not simply a function of self-evaluation apprehension in the abstract but is shaped by the cultural weight attached to linguistic performance within a social hierarchy. Students' avoidance of direct negation (Maybe I not want) and their preference for hedged non-commitment (I not sure) thus reflect a compound process in which culturally prescribed communicative norms interact with and reinforce intralingual error patterns. This finding extends the existing literature on anxiety and EFL speaking in Indonesian contexts (Fenyvesi,

2021; N.W.S.C, 2021) by identifying the specific cultural mechanism, hierarchical politeness norms, through which anxiety is transduced into particular forms of intralingual interference.

T1's identification of culture-responsive pedagogy, targeted phonological drilling, and guided translanguaging as effective strategies is consistent with the recommendations of the broader literature (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Garcia & Wei, 2015), but are grounded in the specific conditions of T1's teaching context. Her use of local folklore as a cultural bridge and her transformation of kerrabhan sapeh into a guided translation exercise represent locally instantiated forms of theoretically endorsed practice, transferable to similar remote EFL settings. These exemplify what Clandinin & Connelly (2000) describe as personal practical knowledge: teacher knowledge that is simultaneously embodied, narrative, and contextually embedded.

Conclusion

This narrative inquiry explored how an experienced EFL teacher in a remote Madurese island school interpreted the occurrence of intralingual interference in her students' spoken English. Rather than viewing speaking difficulties solely as linguistic deficiencies, the teacher's account suggests that learners' language production is embedded within broader sociocultural realities, including local communicative norms, cultural identity, and limited opportunities for authentic English exposure.

The findings indicate that intralingual interference may be understood not only as a consequence of incomplete target-language development but also as a phenomenon experienced and interpreted within specific cultural contexts. From the teacher's perspective, students' efforts to maintain cultural identity, navigate socially valued politeness norms, and manage anxiety during oral communication were closely intertwined with the forms of speaking difficulties observed in the classroom. This perspective highlights the importance of examining language learning as a socially situated process rather than as a purely cognitive or structural one.

The study also underscores the value of teacher knowledge in geographically marginalised educational settings. Teachers working in remote communities often develop context-sensitive understandings of learner behaviour that may not be fully captured by generalised models of second language acquisition. By foregrounding one teacher's narrative, this study contributes a locally grounded perspective to ongoing discussions about EFL learning in multilingual and culturally distinctive environments.

Pedagogically, the findings suggest that addressing speaking difficulties may require approaches that acknowledge rather than suppress learners' cultural and linguistic resources. Practices that connect local cultural knowledge with English language learning, create low-

anxiety speaking environments, and support strategic multilingual meaning-making may provide more meaningful pathways for language development in similar contexts.

This study is necessarily limited by its reliance on a single teacher's narrative account and therefore does not claim to represent the experiences of all EFL teachers or learners in Madura or other Indonesian contexts. Future research could build on these insights by incorporating multiple stakeholder perspectives, including students, classroom observations, and longitudinal evidence, in order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between cultural identity, classroom practices, and EFL speaking development in remote educational settings.

References

- Abdi Tabari, M. (2021). Task preparedness and L2 written production: Investigating effects of planning modes on L2 learners' focus of attention and output. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52, 100814. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100814>
- Amanda, A., Sukma, E. M., & Lubis, Y. (2023). The error analysis that faced by student's in pronounce a words. *PUSTAKA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pendidikan*. <https://doi.org/10.56910/pustaka.v3i4.732>
- Anwari, Purnaningtyas, W., & Hikmah, U. (2020). *The level of language used by Madurese in Kalidandan, Pakuniran, Probolinggo*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/ahsr.k.200723.021>
- Armilah, A., Syahfitri, N., Harahap, N. R., & Nasution, J. S. (2024). Evaluasi pembelajaran berbicara di kelas tinggi. *JISPENDIORA Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Pendidikan Dan Humaniora*. <https://doi.org/10.56910/jispendiora.v3i2.1506>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). Pedagogical translanguaging. *Linguistic approaches to bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788927383>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging and its application to language classes. *RELC Journal*, 53, 342–354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221082751>
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: experience and story in qualitative research*. Wiley. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=r50gHwAACAAJ>
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: a pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25612290>
- Fajariyah, L. (2020). *The social stratification of the Madurese society and its implications on the usage of Bhasa Madhura*. 3, 165–178. <https://doi.org/10.21107/sml.v3i2.7371>
- Fauzi, A. (2026). Problematics of teaching drama in rural elementary schools: a perspective from Madura. *Jurnal Citra Multidisiplin*, 1(3), 257–267. <https://doi.org/10.38048/jcm.v1i3.6793>

- Fauzi, A., Triastuti, A., & Sudarmaji. (2026). Beyond textbooks: culturally responsive english teaching in resource-limited Madurese classrooms. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 13(2 SE-Articles), 286–305. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22373/englisia.162>
- Fenyvesi, K. (2021). Emic perspectives on young Danish learners' foreign language classroom anxiety. *Language Teaching Research*, 28, 948–966. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211001200>
- Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2015). *Translanguaging: language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=H6k7AgAAQBAJ>
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.2307/327317>
- Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and Culture*. OUP Oxford. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=XRPiONIC2PMC>
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. SAGE Publications. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=bZGvwsP1BRwC>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. SAGE Publications. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=2oA9aWlNeooC>
- Luh, N., Dewi, D. S., Gede, I., Wardhana, N. P., Octovianus, Y., & Awololon, L. (2024). The influence of native language on young Indonesian learners' ability to pronounce english short vowels. *Santhet (Jurnal Sejarah Pendidikan Dan Humaniora)*. <https://doi.org/10.36526/santhet.v8i2.4833>
- Masangcay, G. (2022). *Cultural identity: contextualizing and scaffolding language learning process*. <https://consensus.app/papers/cultural-identity-contextualizing-and-scaffolding-masangcay/9230574f35e95aaeab3d12b1062bdf8d/>
- Mudhar, Makinuddin, Simanjuntak, N. M., Mudhar, M., & Simanjuntak. (2024). Normative ethics and descriptive ethics concerning the context of politeness in the ondhagga tradition in Madura. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v4i3.1992>
- N.W.S.C, W. (2021). Speaking anxiety in the second language classroom: learners' perspective. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3808930>
- Nasiri, A., & Gilakjani, A. P. (2016). A review of EFL learners' speaking skill and the strategies for improvement. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 6, 53. <https://consensus.app/papers/a-review-of-efl-learners-speaking-skill-and-the-strategies-nasiri-gilakjani/d923c88af324580dbcc6fae42136f613/>
- Norton, B. (2013). Identity and language learning: extending the conversation. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*, 327–332. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.18799909>

- Octaviana, D. W. (2019). English pronunciation errors by sundanese speakers. *JOURNEY (Journal of English Language and Pedagogy)*. <https://doi.org/10.33503/JOURNEY.V1i2.297>
- Onwochei, M. O., & Bako, A. (2024). Influence of mother tongue on English pronunciation: a contrastive analysis of Bogghom and English phonemes. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities*. <https://doi.org/10.61424/ijah.v2i1.98>
- Rahman, A., Asmaradhani, A. I., & Sutarto. (2020). Phonological investigation into students' mispronunciation of English words containing phonemes absent in Indonesian. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 9, 1620–1625. <https://consensus.app/papers/phonological-investigation-into-students-'-rahman-asmaradhani/320c1069e2565282bc20127caa80174f/>
- Richards, J. C. (1971). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. *ELT Journal*, XXV(3), 204–219. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/XXV.3.204>
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2011). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833835>
- Rostamian, M., Fazilatfar, A. M., & Jabbari, A. A. (2018). The effect of planning time on cognitive processes, monitoring behavior, and quality of L2 writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(4), 418–438. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817699239>
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage: International Review of Applied Linguistics. *Language Teaching*, 10(2), 209.