



RIELT
JOURNAL

PRODUCING ACTIVE SENTENCES IN BAHASA INDONESIA: A CASE STUDY OF INDONESIAN AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION (IFLE) STUDENTS

Ulil Amri

Universitas Jambi
ulil.ludostrait@unja.ac.id

Zubaidah

UIN SMDD Bukittinggi
zubaidah@uinbukittinggi.ac.id

Aprilis Kartika Putri

Universitas Jambi
apriliakp@unja.ac.id

Abstract: The aim of this research is to identify and to compare the ability of Indonesian as a Foreign Language Education (IFLE) students in producing active sentences. The data were active sentences in Bahasa Indonesia produced by 8 international students who had taken and completed the IFLE classes in two Indonesia's universities namely, Universitas Andalas and UIN Imam Bonjol Padang from various nationalities across the globe. The focus on this research is to investigate mistakes and errors of IFLE students in generating Bahasa Indonesia's active sentences and to seek influencing factors in producing utterances. The results indicates that common mistakes and error were categorized into two: 1) in morphosyntactic process and 2) in grammatical structures. Factors that influence the existing mistakes and errors lead to three points: 1) grammatical structures generalization, 2) lexical generalization, and 3) the influences of English language.

Keywords:

active sentences, foreign language learners, grammatical structures, Indonesian as Foreign Language Education (IFLE), morphosyntactic.

A. INTRODUCTION

There are thousands of languages spoken across the globe. Even though it is impossible to establish an exact number (Katzner, 2002) some linguists claims that there are more than 7000 languages existed today (Comrie, 2017; Leben, 2018) which reflecting rich diversity of cultures and the advanced of human communication. This vast linguistic phenomenon underscores the significance of learning foreign languages especially of those who live and study abroad.

As a key educational hub in Southeast Asia, Indonesia has increasingly attracted international students due to its strategic location, diverse cultural landscape, and expanding academic opportunities. In 2020, the country hosted approximately 10,000 international students (thejakartapost.com, 2023), a number that has shown gradual growth in recent years. About 60% of these students are university students which mainly came but not limited from neighboring countries in the Southeast Asia (topuniversities.com, 2025), enrolled in various universities and in variety of academic majors which often influenced by Indonesia's cultural, environmental, regional, and religious uniqueness.

In parallel with this trend, the study of Bahasa Indonesia among non-native speakers has also seen significant expansion. According to recent data from the Indonesian Language Development and Empowerment Center (Pustanda) and the Indonesia's Language Center, approximately 183,000 learners were enrolled in the Indonesian as a Foreign Language Education (IFLE) program in 2025 which is facilitated by more than 300 institutions across Indonesia and 56 other countries worldwide (Septriani, 2025). The widespread uptake of Bahasa Indonesia among international learners not only underscores its rising global relevance but also positions it as the most studied language in Southeast Asia.

The acquisition of Bahasa Indonesia for international students in Indonesian universities, particularly those enrolled in the IFLE classes, has led to a range of mistakes and errors in the process for diverse linguistic backgrounds of the learners. IFLE courses, also known as BIPA (*Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing*) are always issues whether teachers and or students should use Bahasa Indonesia only or they can alternate from Bahasa Indonesia to the students' first language (L1) or English as the lingua franca (Suteja & Purwanti, 2017). The readiness condition of IFLS to support the learning of international students preparing their study abroad are not served satisfactorily (Solikhah & Budiharso, 2020).

Students often come from various countries, each bringing different native languages, phonetic systems, and grammatical structures. These differences can interfere with the acquisition of Bahasa Indonesia, causing challenges in pronunciation, vocabulary usage, sentence construction, and understanding cultural nuances embedded in the language. IFLE students may produce

utterances that deviate from the standard usage, reflecting the influence of their mother tongues, and the complexities in acquiring Bahasa Indonesia.

IFLE students encounter significant challenges in producing sentences in Bahasa Indonesia due to fundamental structural differences between their native languages and Bahasa Indonesia. These differences include variations in word order, verb usage, and sentence construction, often resulting in difficulties producing even simple active sentences accurately. Moreover, many of these students initially learn Bahasa Indonesia through English rather than their native tongue, which adds an additional layer of complexity. This study aims to explore how IFLE students construct active sentences in Bahasa Indonesia, with a focus on identifying common mistakes and errors as well as the factors that contribute to these difficulties.

B. METHODOLOGY

This descriptive study applies a mixed-methods research design (Creswell, 1999; Creswell & Clark, 2017) which integrates quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of how IFLE students produce active sentences in Bahasa Indonesia. The quantitative component focuses on identifying and analyzing grammatical errors in students' production of active sentences. The qualitative component explores external factors influencing students' sentence production, particularly their linguistic and national backgrounds. Additionally, this study utilizes comparative methods (James, 1980) to examine the differences between acceptable active sentence structures in Bahasa Indonesia and those produced by IFLE students.

Data were collected from 8 participants of international students who had enrolled in Universitas Jambi, Universitas Andalas, and UIN Imam Bonjol Padang, all of whom had completed IFLE or BIPA (*Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing*) courses. The data consisted of active sentences in Bahasa Indonesia, obtained through video interviews. Participants came from a variety of national and linguistic backgrounds which consist of 2 Malaysian, 2 Thai, 1 Filipino, and 3 Korean.

To ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data, this study used methodological triangulation (Baker & Egbert, 2016) during the validation process. Interview transcripts were reviewed by multiple researchers to check for consistency and reduce possible errors. Additionally, experts on Bahasa Indonesia were consulted to confirm the grammatical accuracy of the active sentences produced by the participants. This combination of cross-checking and expert validation helped strengthen the overall credibility of the analysis.

The analysis began by transcribing active sentences produced by the IFLE students. These sentences were carefully reviewed to identify mistakes and errors

by focusing on morphosyntactic process and grammatical structures followed by observing patterns and frequency. Interview data were also examined to understand how students' linguistic and national backgrounds influenced their sentence construction. Student sentences were compared with standard structures to highlight differences. To maintain consistency, several researchers independently coded the data and discussed any disagreements. Finally, language experts reviewed the findings to confirm the accuracy of the grammatical assessments, ensuring the study's reliability.

RELATED LITERATURES

International Students in Indonesian Universities

A Research entitled *Equality in Indonesian higher education for international students* (Hastowohadi & Ma'rifatulloh, 2025) examines issues of equality encountered by international students in Indonesian higher education and investigates how these students navigate and reshape their learning trajectories. This study explores the various challenges and inequalities that international students face within Indonesian higher education institutions, including barriers related to access, treatment, and support. It also investigates the ways in which these students actively adapt to and transform their educational experiences to better suit their individual needs and aspirations.

Another research explores the academic and social experiences of 13 international undergraduate students in the international programs at Universitas Jambi (Saharudin et al., 2024). The research identifies numerous key challenges including language barriers since Bahasa Indonesia is the primary instruction language on campus. Further results show that international students report their dissatisfaction with services like insurance, health care, extracurricular activities, and counseling, even though the library services had received positive feedback. The study recommends to adopt English as the instructional language, offering bilingual training for lecturers, and improving infrastructure and student services to better support international students' academic success and well-being.

A research on international students from non-English speaking countries investigates the linguistic errors made by 30 international students at Politeknik Negeri Malang (Putri et al., 2024). The article emphasized that their major courses are taught in English but these students often use Bahasa Indonesia to communicate outside the classroom where they produce some errors that lead to misunderstandings. The analysis focused on their daily conversations which contains errors in pronunciation, word formation, sentence construction, and word choice. The main factors contributing to these errors include low motivation

to learn Indonesian, insufficient support from classmates and lecturers, and limited time for language learning.

Related to the IFLE/BIPA courses, research entitled *International Students' Adjustment Towards Implementing Indonesian Language in Communication* (Marsevani et al., 2024) analyzes international students' ability and perspectives in using Bahasa Indonesia for communication by focusing on the challenges and cultural shocks they experience during language adjustment. This research highlights the importance of Bahasa Indonesia as a communication tool, taught globally through the BIPA program. This Research emphasizes that successful communication in Bahasa Indonesia requires significant adjustment, especially for non-native speakers.

Based on the findings from the four previous studies, it is clear that international university students in Indonesia face various challenges related to culture, adjusting to daily life, and language barriers. These studies highlight the need for more attention and support for international students in Indonesian universities. To address one of these challenges, this study focuses on how IFLE students construct active sentences in Bahasa Indonesia. It aims to identify common mistakes they make and understand the factors behind these difficulties. By doing so, the study hopes to offer useful insights that can help improve teaching methods and support services for international students learning Indonesian.

Active Sentence in Bahasa Indonesia

There is no previous literature which had analyzed active sentence in Bahasa Indonesia produced by non-native speakers. However, a series of analysis on active sentence in Bahasa Indonesia has been conducted couple times by previous researchers. A comparative research of active sentences in Bahasa Indonesia and English investigates differences in sentence construction and verb usage, focusing on the S-V-O patterns in Bahasa Indonesia and English (Sitanggang et al., 2024). The study explores variations in verb forms and agent clarity through qualitative analysis of active sentences. The findings highlight significant disparities in sentence structure and verb use between the two languages which are essential for effective language teaching, to improving learning strategies, and to support more effective cross-cultural communication.

Another research entitled *Analisis Kontrastif Kalimat Aktif dan Kalimat Pasif dalam Bahasa Indonesia san Bahasa Arab* uses contrastive analysis to examine active and passive sentence structures in Bahasa Indonesia and Arabic by comparing the sentence patterns. This research aims to identify similarities and differences that can aid Indonesian learners to have better understanding in Arabic sentence construction. This analysis conducted a thorough grasp of active and passive sentences serves as a foundation for recognizing other sentence

patterns in Arabic, while also enhancing comprehension of sentence structures in Bahasa Indonesia.

The previous two researches conducted analyses of active sentences in Bahasa Indonesia in comparative approach by comparing sentences in Bahasa Indonesia into sentences in Arabic and English. The two researches focused on different areas of expertise in which the first research deals with grammatical structures of the active sentences in Bahasa Indonesia and English and the later emphasized more on the similarities and differences of Bahasa Indonesia and Arabic in order to encourage Indonesian learners to learn Arabic. The current research identifies active sentences in Bahasa Indonesia produced by non-native Indonesian speakers to seek mistakes and errors in the fields of morphosyntactic and grammatical structures of the active sentences and furthermore to see the contributing factors of the mistakes and errors.

Morphosyntactic

Morphosyntax is a branch of linguistics that examines the intersection between morphology and syntax which focuses on how grammatical features encoded in word forms influence their combination in sentences (Nida, 1949). A morphosyntactic process involves changes in word forms that reflect grammatical relationships and influence sentence structure. Nida (1949) proposed three essential aspects on morphosyntactic analysis: 1) phonological aspects which deals with phonetics and phonemics; 2) structural aspects which morphology and syntax; and 3) lexical aspects which related to word meaning and usage (Nida, 1949). This article seeks morphosyntactic aspects of Bahasa Indonesia's active sentences produced by IFLE students and compares them to the acceptable forms in order to seek common mistakes and errors found in the produced sentences.

C. FINDING

This analysis focuses on four active sentences in Bahasa Indonesia (Data 1–4), which were administered to 8 international students enrolled at three Indonesian universities: Universitas Andalas and UIN Imam Bonjol Padang. All participants had completed the Indonesian for Foreign Language Education (IFLE) program, also known as *Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing* (BIPA), and had resided in Indonesia for a minimum of six months. This extended period of immersion provided them with meaningful exposure to the linguistic and sociocultural context of Bahasa Indonesia. The data are provided as follow:

- Datum 1* : My mom buys watermelon in the market every Sunday morning.
(Ibuku membeli semangka di pasar setiap Minggu pagi).
- Datum 2* : Azra does not wear socks bu he wears gloves.

- (Azra tidak memakai kaus kaki tetapi dia memakai sarung tangan).
Datum 3 : Halim and Winda eat sate Padang but Roni eats nasi Padang.
Datum 4 : Kevin met Linda in front of the campus building yesterday afternoon.
 (Kevin bertemu Linda di depan kampus kemarin siang).

Active sentences produced by Malaysian IFLE Students

There are 2 participants of Malaysian Nationality students (NA & AG) who enrolled in UIN Imam Bonjol Padang. Both participants are native to Malay Language and are familiar with Bahasa Indonesia. They speak three languages (Malay, English, and Bahasa Indonesia).

Datum 1

- NA : Ibu saya membeli semangka di pasar setiap pagi Minggu.
 AG : Mama saya beli semangka di pasar setiap pagi Ahad.

Datum 2

- NA : Azra tidak memakai kaus kaki tetapi dia memakai kaus tangan.
 AG : Azra tidak pakai kaus kaki tetapi dia pakai sarung tangan.

Datum 3

- NA : Halim dan Winda makan satai Padang manakala Roni makan nasi Padang.
 AG : Halim dan Winda memakan sate Padang sedang Roni memakan nasi Padang.

Datum 4

- NA : Kevin bertemu Linda di hadapan bangunan kampus petang siang.
 AG : Kevin bertemu Linda di hadapan kampus kemarin petang.

The active sentences produced by NA and AG in Bahasa Indonesia reflect varying degrees of morphosyntactic transfer from their native Malay. In Datum 1, both speakers construct grammatically correct sentences, but Malay influence is evident. NA uses the phrase *Ibu saya* instead of the Indonesian *Ibuku*, and reorders the temporal expression to *pagi Minggu*, following Malay syntax. AG demonstrates more pronounced Malay features through the use of *Mama*, omission of the *me-*prefix in *beli*, and the use of *Ahad* for *Sunday*, a lexical choice typical in Malay. In Datum 2, NA maintains the Indonesian verbal affix *memakai* but substitutes *kaus tangan* for the standard *sarung tangan*, suggesting lexical transfer. AG, meanwhile, omits the verbal prefix entirely, using the bare verb *pakai*, which aligns with Malay morphosyntactic patterns. However, AG correctly uses *sarung tangan*, reflecting partial convergence with standard Indonesian. Datum 3 shows NA employing *satai* and the conjunction *manakala*, both of which are more common in Malay. AG uses *memakan* consistently, demonstrating awareness of Indonesian verb morphology, but opts for *sedang* instead of the standard *sedangkan*, possibly reflecting informal or Malay usage. In Datum 4, both speakers use *di hadapan*

kampus, which is acceptable but reflects a formal or Malay-preferred alternative to the more colloquial *di depan*. NA's temporal phrase *petang siang* is semantically ambiguous, possibly due to interference from Malay temporal distinctions. AG's phrase *kemarin petang* is more natural and contextually appropriate.

Overall, NA tends to preserve Indonesian morphological structures while incorporating Malay lexical and syntactic patterns. AG shows more consistent morphological transfer, particularly in verb constructions, along with Malay lexical preferences. These patterns highlight how L1 Malay influences L2 Bahasa Indonesia in both morphology and syntax.

Tabel 1: Morphosyntactic Pattern of Malaysian IFLE Students in producing Active Sentences in Bahasa Indonesia

Datum	Feature	Standard Indonesian	NA's Usage	AG's Usage
1	Possessive structure	<i>Ibuku</i>	<i>Ibu saya</i>	<i>Mama saya</i>
	Verb morphology	<i>Membeli</i>	<i>Membeli</i>	<i>beli</i>
	Temporal phrase	<i>Minggu pagi</i>	<i>pagi Minggu</i>	<i>pagi Ahad</i>
2	Verb morphology	<i>memakai</i>	<i>memakai</i>	<i>pakai</i>
	Lexical choice (gloves)	<i>sarung tangan</i>	<i>kaus tangan</i>	<i>sarung tangan</i>
3	Verb morphology	<i>makan / memakan</i>	<i>Makan</i>	<i>memakan</i>
	Conjunction	<i>Sedangkan</i>	<i>manakala</i>	<i>sedang</i>
	Lexical choice (sate)	<i>Sate</i>	<i>Satai</i>	<i>sate</i>
4	Preposition	<i>di depan</i>	<i>di hadapan</i>	<i>di hadapan</i>
	Temporal phrase	<i>kemarin siang</i>	<i>petang siang</i>	<i>kemarin petang</i>

Active sentences produced by Thai IFLE Students

There are 2 participants of Thai Nationality students (EM & NIW) who enrolled in UIN Imam Bonjol Padang. Both participants are native to Thai Language and are familiar with Malay Language and Bahasa Indonesia. They speak four languages (Thai Malay, Bahasa Indonesia, and limited English with heavy Thai accent).

Datum 1

EM : Ibu saya beli semangka pasar tiap Minggu pagi.

NIW : Ibuku beli semangka di pasar setiap Minggu pagi.

Datum 2

EM : Azra tak pakai kaus kaki, dia pakai sarung tangan..

NIW : Azra tidak pakai kaus kaki tapi dia pakai sarung tangan.

Datum 3

EM : Halim sama Winda makan sate Padang, tapi Roni makan nasi Padang.
 NIW : Halim dan Winda makan sate Padang, Roni makan nasi Padang.

Datum 4

EM : Kevin ketemu Linda halaman kampus kemarin siang.
 NIW : Kevin bertemu Linda kemarin siang di kampus halaman.

The active sentences produced by EM and NIW reveal several notable morphosyntactic features. In Datum 1, both speakers omit the Indonesian active transitive verb prefix *me-*, using the bare verb *beli* instead of *membeli*. This omission likely reflects transfer from Thai, which does not mark verbs morphologically for transitivity. EM uses the analytic possessive form *Ibu saya*, while NIW employs the standard possessive suffix *Ibuku*, indicating variation in possessive construction strategies. Furthermore, EM sometimes omits the locative preposition *di*, as in *beli semangka pasar*, whereas NIW includes the preposition, demonstrating a stronger grasp of Indonesian locative syntax. Both use acceptable temporal expressions, although EM opts for the less formal *tiap* instead of *setiap*. In Datum 2, the omission of the *me-* prefix continues with the verb *pakai*. EM uses the colloquial negation *tak* in place of the standard *tidak* used by NIW. Both speakers simplify clause coordination, with EM frequently omitting conjunctions and separating clauses with commas, while NIW uses the coordinating conjunction *tapi* appropriately. Pronoun use is consistent in both, as they retain the subject pronoun *dia* in the second clause, which aligns with standard Indonesian. Datum 3 shows variation in coordinating conjunctions, where EM uses the informal *sama* instead of the standard *dan*, possibly influenced by Malay or colloquial usage, while NIW correctly uses *dan*. Both omit the *me-* prefix in verbs and display simplification in conjunction, with EM using *tapi* and NIW sometimes omitting conjunctions altogether. This simplification suggests developing competence in Indonesian clause coordination. In Datum 4, EM prefers the colloquial verb *ketemu* rather than the formal *bertemu* used by NIW. EM also omits the preposition *di* in locative phrases, whereas NIW includes it but alters typical word order by placing temporal adverbs before locative phrases. EM's ordering of locative before temporal phrases without prepositions deviates from standard Indonesian syntax and likely reflects Thai syntactic influence, which organizes spatial and temporal elements differently.

Overall, the data reveal consistent L1 influence on verb morphology, possessive forms, prepositional use, and clause coordination. EM tends toward more colloquial, analytic, and sometimes nonstandard forms, while NIW shows greater adherence to standard Indonesian morphology and syntax but still simplifies certain structures. These patterns underscore the role of morphosyntactic transfer and varying proficiency in shaping the Indonesian output of Thai learners.,

Tabel 2: Morphosyntactic Pattern of Thai IFLE Students in producing Active Sentences in Bahasa Indonesia

Datum	Feature	Standard Indonesian	EM's Production	NIW's Production
1	Verb Morphology	<i>Membeli</i>	<i>Beli</i>	<i>beli</i>
	Possessive Construction	<i>Ibuku</i>	<i>Ibu saya</i>	<i>Ibuku</i>
	Prepositional Usage	<i>di</i> (locative preposition required)	omits <i>di</i>	<i>di</i>
	Temporal Expression	<i>Setiap</i>	<i>Tiap</i>	<i>setiap</i>
2	Negation	<i>Tidak</i>	<i>Tak</i>	<i>tidak</i>
	Verb Morphology	<i>me-</i>	Omits <i>me-</i>	Omits <i>me-</i>
	Coordination	<i>tetapi/tapi</i>	Omits conjunction	<i>tapi</i>
3	Coordination	<i>dan</i> (and) <i>sedangkan</i> (whereas)	<i>Sama tapi</i>	<i>dan</i> omits conjunction
	Verb Morphology	<i>me-</i>	Omits <i>me-</i>	Omits <i>me-</i>
4	Verb Choice	<i>Bertemu</i>	<i>ketemu</i>	<i>bertemu</i>
	Word Order	Temporal phrase follows locative phrase	Locative phrase precedes temporal without preposition	Temporal phrase precedes locative phrase

Active sentences produced by Filipino IFLE Students

There is only 1 participant of The Philippine Nationality students (GD) who enrolled in Universitas Andalas. GD is native to Bisaya Language and are familiar with Tagalog, Bahasa Indonesia, and English in heavy Filipino accent.

Datum 1

GD : Mama ko beli semangka sa pasar every Sunday morning.

Datum 2

GD : Azra tak pakai kaus kaki, pero siya pakai sarung tangan.

Datum 3

GD : Halim dan Winda makan sate Padang, pero si Roni makan nasi Padang.

Datum 4

GD : Kevin ketemu si Linda di harap kampus siang marin.

GD's version of the sentence *Ibuku membeli semangka di pasar setiap Minggu pagi* becomes *Mama ko beli semangka sa pasar every Sunday morning*. This version shows several notable morphosyntactic shifts. The possessive construction *Ibuku* is restructured as *Mama ko*, directly influenced by Tagalog syntax where *ko*

follows the noun. The verb *membeli* is reduced to *beli*, omitting the *me-* prefix, which is typical among second-language learners due to the absence of equivalent morphological processes in Tagalog and Bisaya. The locative preposition *di* is replaced with *sa*, another direct borrowing from Tagalog or Bisaya. Moreover, the time phrase *setiap Minggu pagi* is fully code-switched into English as *every Sunday morning*, which reflects common code-mixing behavior among Filipino multilinguals, especially for fixed or routine time expressions. In GD's production of *Azra tidak memakai kaus kaki tetapi dia memakai sarung tangan*, the sentence becomes *Azra tak pakai kaus kaki, pero siya pakai sarung tangan*. The negation word *tidak* is replaced with *tak*, which may indicate influence from colloquial Indonesian or a simplification strategy. The verb *memakai* is again stripped to its root *pakai*, continuing the pattern of avoiding verb affixation. GD uses *pero*, a Tagalog/Spanish conjunction, in place of *tetapi*, showing preference for familiar discourse connectors. Additionally, the pronoun *dia* is replaced by *siya*, the Tagalog equivalent, pointing to lexical substitution due to higher proficiency or comfort with Tagalog forms. For the sentence *Halim dan Winda makan sate Padang sedangkan Roni makan nasi Padang*, GD says *Halim dan Winda makan sate Padang, pero si Roni makan nasi Padang*. While the coordinating conjunction *dan* is retained, *sedangkan* is replaced with *pero*, again showing consistency in using Tagalog contrastive markers. GD inserts *si* before *Roni*, mimicking the proper noun marker used in Tagalog for personal names. The verb *makan* is unchanged and correctly used in both clauses, but the inclusion of *si* indicates L1 structural influence in marking syntactic roles more explicitly than standard Indonesian. Lastly, GD produces *Kevin ketemu si Linda di harap kampus siang marin* instead of *Kevin bertemu Linda di depan kampus kemarin siang*. The verb *bertemu* becomes *ketemu*, a colloquial and informal alternative commonly heard in spoken Indonesian, and likely acquired through exposure to informal speech. The addition of *si Linda* again reflects Tagalog noun marking. The phrase *di harap kampus* shows lexical transfer, where *harap* is used instead of *hadap* due to semantic similarity between Tagalog and Indonesian, even though they are not interchangeable in context. The time expression *kemarin siang* is restructured as *siang marin* suggesting partial recall and syntactic reordering influenced by Filipino temporal expression.

Overall, GD's sentences reveal consistent morphosyntactic patterns such as verb root simplification, use of Tagalog possessive and subject markers, substitution of Indonesian function words with Tagalog equivalents, and frequent code-mixing with English. These features reflect both transfer from L1 and learning strategies shaped by multilingual exposure and dominance in Filipino languages.

Tabel 3: Morphosyntactic Pattern of Filipino IFLE Student in producing Active Sentences in Bahasa Indonesia

Datum	Feature	Standard BI	GD's Production
1	Possessive	<i>Ibuku</i>	<i>Mama ko</i>
	Verb Morphology	<i>Membeli</i>	<i>Beli</i>
	Preposition	<i>di pasar</i>	<i>sa pasar</i>
	Temporal Expression	<i>setiap Minggu pagi</i>	<i>every Sunday morning</i>
2	Negation	<i>Tidak</i>	<i>Tak</i>
	Verb Morphology	<i>memakai</i>	<i>pakai</i>
	Conjunction	<i>Tetapi</i>	<i>Pero</i>
	Pronoun	<i>Dia</i>	<i>Siya</i>
3	Conjunction	<i>sedangkan</i>	<i>Pero</i>
	Proper Noun Marker	None	<i>si Roni</i>
	Verb Use	<i>makan</i>	<i>Makan</i>
4	Verb Morphology	<i>bertemu</i>	<i>Ketemu</i>
	Proper Noun Marker	None	<i>si Linda</i>
	Preposition	<i>di depan</i>	<i>di harap</i>
	Temporal Phrase	<i>kemarin siang</i>	<i>siang marin</i>

Active sentences produced by Korean IFLE Students

There are 3 participants of Korean Nationality students (JWY, RNH, & LJY) who enrolled in Universitas Andalas. They are native to Korean Language and are familiar with Bahasa Indonesia and English in heavy Korean accent.

Datum 1

- JWY : Ibuku peli semangka di pasar setiap Minggu pagi.
 RNH : Ibu saya peli semangka di pasar tiap pagi Minggu.
 LJY : Ibuku mebeli semangka di pasar setiap hari Minggu pagi.

Datum 2

- JWY : Ajera tidak pakai kaus kaki, tapi dia pakai sarung tangan.
 RNH : Ajera tidak pakai kaus kaki, tapi dia baki sarung tangan.
 LJY : Ajera tidak mbakai kaus kaki, tapi dia pakai sarung tangan.

Datum 3

- JWY : Halim dan Winda makan sate Padang, tapi Roni makan nasi Padang
 RNH : Halim dan Winda makan sate Padang, tapi Roni makan nasi Patang.
 LJY : Halim dan Winda makan sate Badang, tapi Roni makan nasi Padang.

Datum 4

- JWY : Kevin ketemu Linda di depan kampus kemarin siang.
 RNH : Kevin petemu Linda di muka kampus siang kemarin.
 LJY : Kevin ketemu Linda di haraman kampus kemarin siang.

The production of Bahasa Indonesia active sentences by JWY, RNH, and LJY reveals systematic morphosyntactic deviations shaped by their L1 phonology and syntax. One of the most consistent patterns across all three speakers is the confusion between voiced and voiceless consonants. This manifests in substitutions such as /b/ becoming /p/ (*beli* → *pe*li**), /d/ becoming /t/ (*Padang* → *Patang*), or /p/ becoming /b/ (*pakai* → *baki*, *Padang* → *Badang*) (Amri et al., 2025; Choo & O'Grady, 2003; Yeon & Brown, 2013). These substitutions are expected, as Korean lacks the same voicing contrasts and learners often transfer articulatory habits from their native language when producing foreign phonemes.

Another prominent feature is the simplification or misapplication of affixation. The *meN-* prefix, used in forming active verbs, is frequently either dropped or incorrectly assimilated. For instance, JWY and RNH reduce *membeli* to *pe*li**, omitting the prefix entirely and simplifying the verb to its root or a distorted form. LJY attempts to apply the prefix but incorrectly produces *me*beli** instead of *membeli*, revealing confusion with the nasal assimilation rules of the prefix. A similar case appears in *memakai*, which is rendered as *pakai* (unaffixed root form) by JWY and RNH, while LJY produces *mbakai*, reflecting an overgeneralized and misapplied assimilation process.

Syntactically, most utterances maintain the standard subject–verb–object structure of Bahasa Indonesia. However, Korean influence is evident in noun phrase and temporal expression ordering. For instance, RNH's use of *tiap pagi Minggu* and *siang kemarin* instead of the target-like *setiap Minggu pagi* and *kemarin siang* demonstrates a head-final structure transfer from Korean, where modifiers typically precede the head noun. Additionally, LJY overextends temporal marking by inserting *hari* in *setiap hari Minggu pagi*, possibly due to L1-induced over-specification or a desire to produce precise time expressions.

Lexically, errors like *Ajera* for *Azra* result from the absence of the /z/ phoneme in Korean, often leading to substitution with /j/. Similarly, *haraman* in place of *halaman* indicates a mispronunciation influenced by Korean syllable constraints, which often restrict certain consonant clusters or placements of liquids like /l/ (Amri et al., 2025; Choo & O'Grady, 2003; Yeon & Brown, 2013). RNH's use of *di muka* for *di depan* is lexically correct but marked, suggesting overreliance on formal or dictionary input rather than natural usage patterns. The conjunction *tetapi* is frequently simplified to *tapi*, showing a preference for colloquial Indonesian, likely due to greater exposure to spoken rather than formal registers.

Overall, these Korean speakers display developing interlanguage systems characterized by predictable phonological substitutions, morphological simplifications or misapplications, and occasional syntactic reordering influenced by Korean structure. Despite these deviations, their sentences remain largely

intelligible and communicatively functional, illustrating how learners manage L2 production under the influence of L1 structures and limitations.

Tabel 4: Morphosyntactic Pattern of Korean IFLE Student in producing Active Sentences in Bahasa Indonesia

Datum	Feature	Standard BI	JWY	RNH	LJY
1	Verb prefix	<i>Membeli</i>	<i>pe</i> <i>li</i>	<i>pe</i> <i>li</i>	<i>me</i> <i>be</i> <i>li</i>
	Temporal phrase	<i>setiap Minggu pagi</i>	same	<i>tiap pagi Minggu</i>	<i>setiap hari Minggu pagi</i>
	Possessive	<i>Ibuku</i>	<i>Ibuku</i>	<i>Ibu saya</i>	<i>Ibuku</i>
	Phonology	<i>Beli</i>	<i>pe</i> <i>li</i>	<i>pe</i> <i>li</i>	<i>me</i> <i>be</i> <i>li</i>
2	Proper name	<i>Azra</i>	<i>Ajera</i>	<i>Ajera</i>	<i>Ajera</i>
	Verb (1st use)	<i>Memakai</i>	<i>pakai</i>	<i>pakai</i>	<i>mbakai</i>
	Negation	<i>Tidak</i>	<i>tidak</i>	<i>tidak</i>	<i>tidak</i>
	Object (1st)	<i>kaus kaki</i>	<i>kaus kaki</i>	<i>kaus kaki</i>	<i>kaus kaki</i>
	Conjunction	<i>Tetapi</i>	<i>tapi</i>	Omits	Omits
3	Conjunction	<i>Tetapi</i>	<i>tapi</i>	<i>tapi</i>	<i>tapi</i>
	Verb (1st clause)	<i>Makan</i>	<i>makan</i>	<i>makan</i>	<i>makan</i>
	Subject (1st clause)	<i>Halim dan Winda</i>	<i>Halim dan Winda</i>	<i>Halim dan Winda</i>	<i>Halim dan Winda</i>
	Object (1st clause)	<i>sate Padang</i>	<i>sate Padang</i>	<i>sate Padang</i>	<i>sate Badang</i>
	Subject (2nd clause)	<i>Roni</i>	<i>Roni</i>	<i>Roni</i>	<i>Roni</i>
	Verb (2nd clause)	<i>Makan</i>	<i>makan</i>	<i>makan</i>	<i>makan</i>
4	Verb (ber-prefix)	<i>Bertemu</i>	<i>ketemu</i>	<i>petemu</i>	<i>ketemu</i>
	Subject	<i>Kevin</i>	<i>Kevin</i>	<i>Kevin</i>	<i>Kevin</i>
	Object	<i>Linda</i>	<i>Linda</i>	<i>Linda</i>	<i>Linda</i>
	Prepositional phrase	<i>di depan kampus</i>	<i>di depan kampus</i>	<i>di muka kampus</i>	<i>di haraman kampus</i>
	Temporal expression	<i>kemarin siang</i>	<i>kemarin siang</i>	<i>siang kemarin</i>	<i>kemarin siang</i>

Contributing Factors to Morphosyntactic Errors Made by IFLE Students in Constructing Active Sentences in Bahasa Indonesia

1. Grammatical Structures Generalization

Errors in grammatical structures among IFLE students frequently stem from overgeneralization and the influence of their first languages (L1). Many learners apply familiar grammatical rules from their L1 to Bahasa Indonesia, often leading to incorrect use or omission of verb affixes. For instance, Thai and Korean students commonly omit or misapply the *meN-* or *ber-* affixes, producing simplified forms like

beli instead of *membeli*, or *pakai* in place of *memakai*. This pattern suggests that learners are either unaware of the function of affixation in Indonesian grammar or are influenced by the structural simplicity of their native languages, which may not mark transitivity or voice morphologically. Moreover, errors such as *mebeli* or *mbakai* point to attempts at nasal assimilation that reflect incomplete understanding of affixation rules. Korean students also tend to reorder time expressions based on Korean syntactic norms, as seen in constructions like *siang kemarin*, deviating from standard Indonesian syntax (*kemarin siang*). These errors demonstrate the learners' tendency to apply familiar grammatical structures across languages, resulting in the distortion of standard Indonesian sentence patterns.

2. Lexical Generalization

Lexical errors often arise from the transfer of words or expressions from learners' native languages or other familiar languages, such as Malay or Tagalog. Malaysian learners, for example, substituted culturally familiar terms like *satai* and *Ahad* (Sunday) in place of the standard Indonesian forms *sate* and *Minggu*, respectively. These substitutions reflect not only lexical overlap but also a generalization of L1 vocabulary due to perceived similarity or mutual intelligibility. Filipino learners frequently imported grammatical particles from Tagalog, such as *si* and *sa*, into Indonesian contexts, producing phrases like *si Roni* and *sa pasar*, which are not grammatically acceptable in standard Indonesian. Additionally, some errors result from logical guessing or semantic approximation based on surface-level meanings, for instance, using *kaus tangan* (literally "hand shirt") instead of *sarung tangan* (gloves). These examples show that lexical generalization is driven both by cross-linguistic similarity and by learners' attempts to compensate for lexical gaps through approximation or borrowing from familiar language structures.

3. Influence of English

Although not the learners' first language, English significantly influences IFLE students' sentence construction in Bahasa Indonesia, especially when English is used as a medium of instruction. The impact is evident in the use of English word order, vocabulary, and syntactic structures. For example, one Filipino student used the phrase *every Sunday morning* instead of the appropriate Indonesian expression *setiap Minggu pagi*, indicating direct translation and code-switching. The simplification of verbs, such as using *beli* or *pakai* without affixation, may also reflect the influence of English, where verbs are typically not morphologically marked for voice or aspect in the same way. Additionally, English conjunctions like *but* or *pero* occasionally appear in learner output, suggesting that English functions as a bridge language for expressing ideas when the appropriate Indonesian forms are unknown or inaccessible. This influence highlights the role of English as both a support and a source of interference in multilingual learning environments, particularly when students rely on English for instruction, reference materials, or cross-linguistic transfer.

D. DISCUSSION

The results of an analysis of Bahasa Indonesia's Active Sentences produced by IFLE students indicates that the L1s of the students are affected their ability in producing active sentences in Bahasa Indonesia. This is in line with the result analysis of an article entitled *Interferensi Bahasa Melayu Terhadap Bahasa Indonesia pada TKI di Dusun Getap Kecamatan Suralaga* (Diniarti et al., 2017). The result shows that linguistic interference in the speech of Indonesian migrant workers (TKI) in Malaysia is influenced by their prolonged stay, frequent interaction with Malays, and habitual use of the Malaysian language. This interference appears in phonology (e.g., changes or omissions in sounds), morphology (e.g., use of Malaysian affixes, prepositions, and reduplication), and syntax, where Malaysian sentence structures affect Indonesian grammar and usage. The similar findings are also found in another publication which reveals that first language transfer can have both beneficial and detrimental effects, depending on the similarities between the two languages (Fitri & Alawiyah, 2023). The research shows that factors such as age, anxiety, and motivation also influence the extent of language interference. Older learners are more prone to interference than younger ones. These findings highlight the need for teaching strategies that enhance positive transfer and reduce negative interference in second language learning.

Related to contributing factors, an article entitled *Role of L1 and L2 in the Acquisition of Bahasa Indonesia as a Third Language* concludes that both L1 and L2 contribute to L3 acquisition, particularly in articulation and vocabulary (Kholiq et al., 2024). This research found that L1 influences L3 phonology when its typology is similar to L3, while L2 helps in mastering L3 sounds absent in L1 when L1 and L3 are typologically different. In vocabulary acquisition, L1 serves as the main source if it is typologically close to L3, whereas L2 takes on that role when L1 is more distant. Typological similarity is identified as the most influential factor in L3 acquisition. Although factors like L2 status, working memory, and overall memory also play a role, their impact is secondary, and further research is recommended with participants who have more diverse language backgrounds. The result analysis of this previous research relevant to the result of the current research where phonological aspects affected the production of sentences in L2 in which Korean international students mixed the voiced and voiceless sounds in Bahasa Indonesia because in Korean such sounds are of the same morphemes (Sung & Cho, 2010).

E. CONCLUSION

The analysis of active sentence production by IFLE students from Malaysian, Thai, Filipino, and Korean backgrounds reveals distinct morphosyntactic patterns shaped by their respective first languages. Malaysian learners generally maintain

Indonesian morphological structures but transfer lexical and syntactic features from Malay. Thai learners often omit Indonesian verb prefixes and prepositions, reflecting differences in Thai morphology and syntax. Filipino learners exhibit extensive code-switching, lexical borrowing, and structural transfer from Tagalog and Bisaya, including the use of native possessive markers alongside English temporal expressions. Korean learners show phonological substitutions, morphological simplifications, and syntactic reordering influenced by Korean linguistic features. Across all groups, L1 influence is evident in verb morphology, possessive constructions, prepositions, conjunctions, and temporal expressions, highlighting the complex interplay of language transfer and interlanguage development in IFLE contexts.

The morphosyntactic errors observed arise primarily from overgeneralization of L1 grammatical structures, lexical transfer and approximation, and the pervasive influence of English as both a medium of instruction and a cross-linguistic reference. Learners apply familiar syntactic patterns and simplify morphology, resulting in omissions or incorrect affixation, non-standard word orders, and lexical substitutions. English's role is twofold, facilitating communication but also causing interference through direct translation and code-switching. These factors collectively illustrate the dynamic nature of interlanguage development shaped by multilingual backgrounds and instructional contexts.

For future research, it is recommended to include larger, more diverse samples to better capture cross-linguistic influences on Bahasa Indonesia acquisition. Longitudinal studies would provide insight into interlanguage development over time. Incorporating qualitative methods, such as learner interviews and think-aloud protocols, could uncover cognitive processes behind errors. Comparative research on different teaching approaches and language input types may identify effective strategies to reduce errors. Lastly, further exploration of English's mediating role in multilingual settings could guide more targeted instructional interventions to improve IFLE learners' proficiency.

REFERENCES

- Amri, U., Husna, L., Kartika Putri, A., Zubaidah, Z., & Pratiwi, A. (2025). Fonem Konsonan, Vokal, dan Diftong dalam Bahasa Minangkabau dan Bahasa Korea: Kajian Linguistik Kontrastif. *Puitika*, 1(1), 83–102.
<https://jurnalpuitika.fib.unand.ac.id/index.php/jurnalpuitika/article/view/689>
- Baker, P., & Egbert, J. (2016). *Triangulating Methodological Approaches in Corpus Linguistic Research*. Taylor & Francis.
<https://books.google.co.id/books?id=-cdTDAAQBAJ>
- Choo, M., & O'Grady, W. (2003). *The sounds of Korean: A pronunciation guide* (Vol. 1). University of Hawaii Press.

- Comrie, B. (2017). Languages of the world. *The Handbook of Linguistics*, 21–38.
- Creswell, J. W. (1999). Mixed-method research: Introduction and application. In *Handbook of educational policy* (pp. 455–472). Elsevier.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. SAGE Publications.
<https://books.google.co.id/books?id=A39ZDwAAQBAJ>
- Diniarti, D. A., Amrulloh, A., & Syahdan, S. (2017). Interferensi Bahasa Melayu Terhadap Bahasa Indonesia pada TKI di Dusun Getap Kecamatan Suralaga. *PRASASTI: Journal of Linguistics*, 2(2), 205–221.
- Fitri, R., & Alawiyah, T. (2023). The impact of first language on second language acquisition: Transfer and interference. *Transformational Language, Literature, and Thechnology Overview in Learning (TRANSTOOL)*, 2(4), 8–13.
- Hastowohadi, & Ma'rifatulloh, S. (2025). Equality in Indonesian higher education for international students: A narrative inquiry. *Journal of International Students*, 15(1), 87–106. <https://doi.org/10.32674/h4tmp642>
- James, C. (1980). *Contrastive Analysis*. Longman.
<https://books.google.co.id/books?id=pnGwAAAIAAJ>
- Katzner, K. (2002). *The Languages of the World*. Routledge.
<https://books.google.co.id/books?id=FO-mRpSog0YC>
- Kholiq, A., Yulianto, B., & Suhartono, S. (2024). Role of L1 And L2 In The Acquisition of Bahasa Indonesia as A Third Language. *Issues in Language Studies*, 13(1), 413–431.
- Leben, W. R. (2018). Languages of the World. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of linguistics*.
- Marsevani, M., Satrio, A. A., Teresa, A., Sayow, E. L. M., Darsono, E. R. F., Fitriana, N., & Selinna, S. (2024). International Students' Adjustment Towards Implementing Indonesian Language in Communication. *IALLTEACH (Issues In Applied Linguistics & Language Teaching)*, 6(1).
- Nida, E. A. (1949). *Morphology: The descriptive analysis of words*.
- Putri, A. N., Sri Gustiani, & Yogi Widiawati. (2024). Linguistic Errors Encountered by Overseas Students from Non-English Speaking Countries While Speaking in Indonesian. *Journal of Innovation Research and Knowledge*, 4(5), 3097–3110. <https://www.bajangjournal.com/index.php/JIRK/article/view/8747>
- Septriani, H. (2025). *Bahasa Indonesia kian Mendunia melalui BIPA*. scientia.id.
<https://scientia.id/2025/04/20/bahasa-indonesia-kian-mendunia-melalui-bipa/>
- Sitanggang, F. Y., Nisa, K., Hutabarat, E. M., & Siallagan, L. (2024). Analisis Kontrasif Kalimat Aktif dalam Bahasa Indonesia dan Bahasa Inggris. *Journal of Humanities Education Management Accounting and Transportation*, 1(2), 748–755.

- Solikhah, I., & Budiharso, T. (2020). Standardizing BIPA as an international program of a language policy. *Asian ESP Journal*, 16(5.2), 181–205.
- Sung, E.-K., & Cho, Y.-J. (2010). An acoustic study of Korean and English voiceless sibilant fricatives. *Phonetics and Speech Sciences*, 2(3), 37–46.
- Suteja, H., & Purwanti, C. (2017). Code Switching in BIPA Classes: Teachers' and Students' Attitudes. *Polyglot: Jurnal Ilmiah*, 13(1), 43–52.
- thejakartapost.com. (2023, February 14). *Road less traveled: Indonesia through the lens of international students* [News]. The Jakarta Post.
<https://www.thejakartapost.com/culture/2023/02/14/road-less-traveled-indonesia-through-the-lens-of-international-students.html>
- topuniversities.com. (2025). *Destination Guides Study in Indonesia*. Top universities. <https://www.topuniversities.com/where-to-study/asia/indonesia/guide>
- Yeon, J., & Brown, L. (2013). *Korean: A comprehensive grammar*. Routledge.