



AN INTERNATIONAL HYBRID CONFERENCE

12th COTEFL

Conference on Teaching
English as A Foreign
Language

*Paths to Maximize the AI's Roles in
Shaping Future Language Education
and Literacy Studies*

5th CELTI

Conference on English
Language Teaching

Phonological Challenges in Second Language Acquisition: A Generative and Optimality-Theoretic Approach to Multilingual Learners in Medan

Author's:

Dedy Suhery^{1*}; Mutiara Zein²; Zahratul
Idami¹; Krisna Weny²; Nidiya Mawarni²

Affiliation:

¹IAIN Langsa, Indonesia

²Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan,
Indonesia

Corresponding email:

dedysuhery@iainlangsa.ac.id

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.24090/celti.2025.1344>

Pages:

13-24

Abstract: This study investigates the phonological challenges encountered by multilingual learners in Medan during the process of second language acquisition (SLA), with a specific focus on English as the target language. Drawing on the theoretical frameworks of Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory (OT), this research analyzes the influence of the learners' first and second languages—predominantly Bahasa Indonesia and regional languages such as Batak and Minangkabau—on their English phonological output. Focusing on voiced and voiceless consonants, the study identifies common patterns of interference, including devoicing, fronting, and stopping. Data were collected from ten participants aged 7 to 15 years through a reading task comprising English words containing target consonants. The findings revealed systematic deviations, such as /ʃ/ → /s/, /z/ → /s/, /v/ → /f/, and /θ/ → /t/, reflecting the influence of native phonological rules on English pronunciation. The study applies Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory to analyze these patterns, offering insights into the processes underlying the interference. Results demonstrate that the learners simplify or substitute challenging sounds based on their linguistic background, highlighting the impact of native phonological systems. The study concludes that both universal markedness and language-specific constraints play crucial roles in shaping L2 phonology in a multilingual context. Implications for pronunciation teaching and curriculum design are also discussed, emphasizing the need for context-sensitive pedagogical strategies in multilingual regions like Medan.

Keywords: *english pronunciation; generative phonology; optimality theory; phonological interference; young learners*

Copyright © 2025 by Author/s. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

The linguistic diversity in Indonesia, where numerous languages coexist, create bilingualism or even multilingualism. With more than 700 languages spoken throughout its enormous archipelago, Indonesia is well known for its extraordinary linguistic variety. The linguistic diversity of Indonesia, the biggest island nation in the world, is a reflection of its diverse ethnic, cultural, and geographical (Eberhard et al., 2023). Local languages from Aceh in the west to Papua in the east are essential served of identity, history, and custom for the community who speak them. Because of its richness, linguists and anthropologists alike are now interested in Indonesia.

Medan, as the capital city of North Sumatra, is a vibrant and diverse illustration of a multilingual metropolitan city. Batak, Malay, Javanese, Chinese, Minangkabau, and other ethnic groups are among the many ethnic groups that call the city home, and their presence adds to its rich linguistic environment. Since Bahasa Indonesia, regional languages, and other minority languages have all been encouraged by this multiculturalism, Medan is a microcosm of Indonesia's linguistic variety (Siregar, 2010). This phenomenon is particularly significant in the English pronunciation of young learners in Medan. The data from these learners show distinct patterns of phonological interference, including devoicing, fronting, and stopping of sounds, which can be analyzed using two prominent theoretical frameworks: Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory (OT). Generative Phonology, pioneered by Chomsky & Halle (1968), provides a rule-based framework to describe the phonological processes underlying interference. In contrast, Optimality Theory offers a constraint-based approach, where competing phonological constraints determine the optimal surface form. It was first proposed as a model of phonological grammar, and that is still its primary domain of application (McCarthy, 2007).

Phonological interference has been widely studied across different linguistic contexts. Suhery et al. (2024) examined phonological interference in the pronunciation of Indonesian by Acehese speakers, focusing on consonant devoicing. Their findings revealed patterns such as the voiced stop /b/ being replaced by the voiceless /p/ (e.g., Abdi → [Apdi]) and the voiced stop /d/ being replaced by /t/ (e.g., a.had → [a.hat]). These patterns are comparable to the devoicing observed in young learners in Medan, where English fricatives and stops are similarly affected. This study highlights how native language phonology, like Acehese, significantly influences second-language pronunciation, providing valuable context for understanding the challenges faced by young learners in Medan.

In sum, both Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory provide valuable frameworks for understanding the phonological interference observed in the English pronunciation of young learners in Medan. By analyzing the processes of devoicing, fronting, and stopping, these theories offer insights into how learners' native phonological systems influence their English pronunciation and help identify the rules or constraints governing these patterns of interference.

Despite extensive research on phonological interference in second language acquisition, there is a lack of studies focusing specifically on the interference of voiced and voiceless consonants in the English pronunciation of young learners in multilingual regions like Medan. While studies have addressed general phonological transfer, the specific patterns of devoicing, fronting, and stopping in this context have not been thoroughly explored. Additionally, there is limited research that applies Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory to analyze these patterns in Indonesian learners, particularly in a multilingual setting where multiple native languages could influence English pronunciation. Therefore, this research aims to fill this gap by providing a detailed analysis of phonological interference in English pronunciation, using the frameworks of Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory.

Research Method

This study used a descriptive research design by Creswell (2014) that involves a systematic investigation into a social or human issue with the goal of gaining a deep understanding of it. This approach revolves around creating a comprehensive and intricate representation of the subject of study using language, capturing and presenting the unique viewpoints of the individuals involved, and conducting the research within a naturalistic setting (Suhery et al., 2023). This study investigated phonological interference in the English pronunciation of voiced and voiceless consonants by young

learners in Medan and aimed to analyze deviations in articulation, focusing on natural occurrences of devoicing, fronting, and stopping. Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory were applied to explain the phonological processes. This approach provided insights into the influence of native phonology on English pronunciation.

Applying qualitative research fits this study because it aligns with the fundamental characteristics of qualitative research. In qualitative research, pursuing an absolute "truth" is not the objective; instead, the emphasis is on elucidating, portraying, and scrutinising evidence (Ansell, J., & Phillips, 1994). The data were collected through a reading task in which 10 participants aged 7 to 15. The words were selected to include frequent instances of devoicing, fronting, and stopping. Participants were purposively selected based on their use of Bahasa Indonesia or local languages such as Batak, Minangkabau, Malay, etc. The distribution of participants according to age and gender can be found in the table that follows.

Table 1. Participant Description

Age (years)	Male	Female
7-15	5	5

The primary instrument for data collection was a reading task comprising carefully selected English words designed to test instances of devoicing, fronting, and stopping. Words were chosen to include voiced and voiceless consonants as well as challenging phonemes, ensuring coverage of target phonological processes. The word list used presents in Table 2 presents to assess phonological interference:

Table 2. Word List

Word	Phonetic Transcription
Short	/ʃɔ:rt/
Freeze	/fri:z/
Mouth	/maʊθ/
Save	/seɪv/

The data was collected using a TASCAM Digital audio recorder and then transcribed into the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). Finally, the researcher employed Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory to investigate the key linguistic aspects influenced by interlingual interference among multilingual learners.

Results & Discussion

The data provided indicate that participants exhibit systematic phonological deviations in their pronunciation of English words. These deviations primarily involve changes in the manner and voicing of consonants, suggesting interference from the participants' first language. The following types of deviations were observed:

Table 3. Pronunciation Deviations Produced by Participant

Process	Target Pronunciation	Words
Devoicing	Voiced → Voiceless	Freeze, Safe
Fronting	Post-alveolar fricative /ʃ/ → alveolar fricative /s/	Short
Stopping	Fricative → Stop	Mouth

Based on the analysis of the data, the pronunciation deviations exhibited by participants fall into three primary types: devoicing, fronting, and stopping. These deviations indicate systematic interference from the participants' first language when attempting to articulate English sounds that are either absent or realized differently in their phonological system.

1. Phonological Rules Implementation

A phonological rule describe how a speaker goes from the abstract representation stored in their brain, to the actual sound they articulate when they speak (Abdul & Jarinikh, 2018). In this study, the researchers merely focus on devoicing, stopping, and fronting processes.

a. Devoicing

Devoicing of stops can be explained by the accumulation of air behind the closure in the mouth, which leads to a decrease in the trans-glottal pressure drop and causes the vocal folds to cease vibrating. Therefore, devoicing of stops typically occurs as a natural result of an oral closure, provided that the velar port is sealed and the speaker does not utilize an active or passive method to counteract the transglottal pressure drop (Hara et al., 2024; Mose, 2021).

This phenomenon is observed in Indonesian, which demonstrates final-obstruent devoicing, where voiced obstruents change to voiceless sounds at the ends of words. Devoicing was identified in this study. The word "freeze" /fri:z/ is pronounced as /fris/, "save" /seiv/ is pronounced as /seif/, and "love" /lʌv/ is pronounced as /lʌf/. The pronunciation changes observed can be explained through phonological rules below:

1) /fri:z/ → /fris/

Rule: /z/ → /s/

Condition: The voiced alveolar fricative /z/ is devoiced to the voiceless alveolar fricative /s/.

Formalized rule:

/z/ → /s/ _

This process is an example of devoicing, where a voiced sound is replaced with its voiceless counterpart.

Feature change:

Feature	/z/	/s/
[+ continuant]	+	+
[+ strident]	+	+
[+ alveolar]	+	+
[+ voice]	+	-

2) /seiv/ → /seif/

Rule: /v/ → /f/

Condition: The voiced labiodental fricative /v/ is devoiced to the voiceless labiodental fricative /f/.

Formalized rule:

/v/ → /f/ _

This is another example of devoicing.

Feature change:

Feature	/v/	/f/
[+ continuant]	+	+
[+ labiodental]	+	+
[+ voice]	+	-

b. Stopping

The researchers in this investigation discovered that stopping is the substitution of stops for fricatives. Another phonological pattern that (Asare & Orfson-Offei, 2023) defined as stopping is the substitution of a stop consonant that shares the same or a similar location of articulation for a fricative or affricate. In Indonesian there isn't /θ/ sounds. Therefore, Indonesian children tend to substitute /θ/ with /t/. Stopping was identified in this study, the word mouth /mauθ/ is pronounced as /maut/. The pronunciation changes observed can be explained through phonological rules below:

1) /mauθ/ → /maut/

Rule: /θ/ → /t/

Condition: The voiceless dental fricative /θ/ is replaced by the voiceless alveolar stop /t/.

Formalized rule:

/θ/ → /t/

This is an example of stopping, where a fricative sound is replaced by a stop.

Feature change:

Feature	/θ/	/t/
[+ continuant]	+	-
[+ dental]	+	-
[+ alveolar]	-	+
[+ distributed]	+	-
[- voice]	-	-

c. Fronting

There are essentially two types of fronting: palatal and velar. Palatal fronting occurs when an alveolar phoneme replaces a palatal phoneme. Palatal fronting is a type of phonological process often seen in children's speech development. It occurs when a sound that is normally made in the palate area of the mouth. In Indonesian there isn't /ʃ/ sounds. Therefore, Indonesian children tend to substitute /ʃ/ with /s/. Palatal fronting is considered as a normal part of speech development in young children (Asare & Orfson-Offei, 2023). Palatal fronting was identified in this study. The word short /ʃɔ:rt/ is pronounced as /sort/. The pronunciation changes observed can be explained through phonological rules below:

1) /ʃɔ:rt/ → /sort/

Rule: /ʃ/ → /s/

Condition: palato-alveolar fricative /ʃ/ is replaced by the alveolar fricative /s/.

Formalized rule:

/ʃ/ → /s/

This substitution may occur due to the speaker's linguistic background or difficulty distinguishing between /ʃ/ and /s/.

Feature change:

Feature	/ʃ/	/s/
[+continuant]	+	+
[+ strident]	+	+
[+postalveolar]	+	-
[+ distributed]	+	-
[- voice]	-	-

2. Optimality Theory Implementation

In Optimality Theory (OT), the core of optimality theory is the idea that language is a system of conflicting forces (Kager, 2004). These forces are represented by constraints, each of which places a demand on certain aspects of the grammatical output forms. The faithfulness constraints ensure that linguistic outputs maintain a close correspondence to their inputs, preserving features of the original forms (Mose, 2021; Prince & Smolensky, 1993). These constraints resist changes to the input, striving for accuracy in the output. Faithfulness constraints include MAX-IO, which requires that all elements in the input are preserved in the output; DEP-IO, which prohibits the addition of elements not present in the input; and IDENT-IO, which demands that specific features of the input (e.g., voicing) remain unchanged in the output. In this study, participants' word productions were analyzed to evaluate how faithfulness constraints interact with markedness constraints, as shown in the following tableau.

Tableau 1. The representation of /ʃɔ:rt/ to [sort] pronounced by Multilingual learners in Medan

Short /ʃɔ:rt/	MAX-IO	DEP-IO	IDENT-IO
a. [sort]			*
b. [sot]	*!		

In Tableau 1, the input /ʃɔ:rt/ results in the optimal output [sort] based on the interaction of faithfulness constraints in Optimality Theory. The MAX-IO constraint, which ensures that all segments in the input are preserved in the output, is satisfied by candidate a ([sort]) as no segment is deleted. However, candidate b ([sot]) violates MAX-IO due to the omission of the segment /r/, leading to its rejection since MAX-IO is highly ranked in this analysis. The second constraint, DEP-IO, which prohibits the addition of new elements in the output, is satisfied by both candidates as neither introduces new segments. Consequently, DEP-IO does not play a decisive role in the selection of the optimal candidate.

The third constraint, IDENT-IO, which requires features such as place and voicing to remain unchanged, is violated by candidate a ([sort]) due to the substitution of the palato-alveolar fricative /ʃ/

with the simpler alveolar fricative /s/. In contrast, candidate b ([sot]) adheres to IDENT-IO, but its violation of MAX-IO overrides this advantage. Therefore, [sort] is selected as the optimal candidate because it satisfies the higher-ranked constraints MAX-IO and DEP-IO, despite violating IDENT-IO. This outcome reflects the learners' tendency to simplify complex sounds like /ʃ/, which are absent in their native phonological system, aligning with markedness constraints that prioritize universal ease of articulation over feature faithfulness. The result underscores the influence of phonological interference from the learners' first language on their English pronunciation.

Tableau 2. The representation of /fri:z/ to [fri:s] pronounced by Multilingual learners in Medan

Freeze /fri:z/	MAX-IO	DEP-IO	IDENT-IO
a. [fri:s]			*
b. [peris]	*!	*!	
c. [feris]	*!	*!	

In Tableau 2, the input /fri:z/ results in the optimal output [fri:s] based on the ranking of faithfulness constraints in Optimality Theory. The MAX-IO constraint, which ensures all input segments are preserved in the output, is satisfied by candidate a ([fri:s]), as no segments are deleted. Conversely, both candidate b ([peris]) and candidate c ([feris]) violate MAX-IO because additional segments (e.g., the initial /p/ and /f/) appear in their outputs, which are not present in the input. As MAX-IO is highly ranked, these violations make candidates b and c not optimal.

The second constraint, DEP-IO, which prohibits the addition of new elements, is also violated by candidates b ([peris]) and c ([feris]) due to the insertion of new segments not present in the input. Candidate a ([fri:s]), however, adheres to this constraint since no additional elements are introduced. Finally, IDENT-IO, which requires features like voicing to remain unchanged between the input and output, is violated by candidate a ([fri:s]) as the voiced alveolar fricative /z/ is devoiced to /s/. Despite this violation, [fri:s] is selected as the optimal candidate because it satisfies the higher-ranked constraints MAX-IO and DEP-IO. This pattern demonstrates the learners' tendency to simplify complex sounds, such as voiced fricatives, in favor of voiceless alternatives, reflecting the phonological interference of their native language.

Tableau 3. The representation of /maʊθ/ to [maut] pronounced by Multilingual learners in Medan

Mouth /maʊθ/	MAX-IO	DEP-IO	IDENT-IO
a. [maut]			*
b. [mot]	*!	*	
c. [mut]	*!		

In Tableau 3, the input /maʊθ/ leads to the optimal output [maut] based on the evaluation of faithfulness constraints in Optimality Theory. The MAX-IO constraint, which ensures that all segments in the input are preserved in the output, is satisfied by candidate a ([maut]) as all input segments are retained. In contrast, candidates b ([mot]) and c ([mut]) violate MAX-IO because they fail to preserve the diphthong /aʊ/, which is a critical component of the input. Given the high ranking of MAX-IO, these violations disqualify candidates b and c as suboptimal.

The second constraint, DEP-IO, which prohibits the addition of new segments, is satisfied by all candidates in this tableau since no new elements are introduced. However, the IDENT-IO constraint, which requires features such as place and manner of articulation to remain unchanged, is violated by candidate a ([maut]) because the voiceless dental fricative /θ/ is replaced with the voiceless alveolar stop /t/. Despite this violation, [maut] is selected as the optimal candidate because it satisfies the higher-ranked MAX-IO. This substitution reflects the learners' phonological preference for simpler sounds that align with their native language's inventory, showcasing a pattern of stopping where fricatives are replaced with stops. This phonological interference underscores the influence of native phonology on the learners' English pronunciation.

Tableau 4. The representation of /serv/ to [seif] pronounced by Multilingual learners in Medan

Save /seɪv/	MAX-IO	DEP-IO	IDENT-IO
a. [seif]			*
b. [sef]	*!	*	
c. [sep]		*!	

In Tableau 4, the input /serv/ results in the optimal output [seif] based on the prioritization of faithfulness constraints in Optimality Theory. The MAX-IO constraint, which ensures that all input segments are preserved in the output, is satisfied by candidate a ([seif]) as all segments from the input are retained. However, candidate b ([sef]) violates MAX-IO due to the omission of the diphthong /eɪ/, while candidate c ([sep]) violates MAX-IO by failing to preserve both the diphthong /eɪ/ and the fricative /v/. As MAX-IO is a high-ranking constraint, these violations render candidates b and c suboptimal.

The second constraint, DEP-IO, which prohibits the addition of new segments, is satisfied by all candidates since no new elements are introduced. The IDENT-IO constraint, which requires features such as voicing and manner of articulation to remain unchanged, is violated by candidate a ([seif]) due to the devoicing of the labiodental fricative /v/ to /f/. Despite this violation, [seif] is selected as the optimal candidate because it satisfies the higher-ranked MAX-IO and DEP-IO constraints. This pattern reflects a common phonological interference where voiced fricatives are replaced with voiceless counterparts, influenced by the learners' native language phonology. The learners' substitutions highlight their preference for simpler, unmarked sounds, emphasizing the impact of native phonological systems on their English pronunciation.

3. Interference Factors

Several key factors contribute to phonological interference observed in the processes of devoicing, stopping, and fronting. These include the impact of the native language, age, and distinctions in linguistic characteristics. These factors were stated by Uriel Weinreich as cited in (Abazova, 2019). Below is an analysis of how these factors influence the learners' pronunciation patterns.

a. The Impact of The Native Language

To begin with, the native language has an impact on students' pronunciation as their speech apparatus has adapted to create sounds from their first language. This is supported by responses from all students, who mentioned that they have been using their native language since childhood and continue to use it in everyday conversations.

b. Age

Age plays a role in students' pronunciation, as they seldom employ the second language, particularly in speaking, due to a lack of practice. This aligns with the critical period hypothesis, which suggests that individuals who learn a second language at a younger age tend to perform better. According to the results, students who started learning English at teenage ages experienced more pronunciation issues compared to those who began their studies at early ages.

c. The Distinctions in Linguistic Characteristics

Moreover, the distinctions in linguistic characteristics between English and the students' mother tongues contribute to pronunciation challenges, as students struggle to correctly articulate English words. The study's results showed that certain English sounds do not exist in the students' native languages, and some English sounds share the same phonetic symbols as sounds in the native language but are pronounced differently. Consequently, students' native language interfered with their English pronunciation.

Conclusion

This study examines phonological interference in the English pronunciation of young multilingual learners in Medan, with a focus on voiced and voiceless consonants. Medan's linguistic diversity, particularly the influence of Bahasa Indonesia and regional languages, creates challenges in acquiring English Pronunciation. Using Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory as analytical frameworks, the research investigates patterns such as devoicing, fronting, and stopping. Results revealed systematic deviations, such as /j/ → /s/, /z/ → /s/, /v/ → /f/, and /θ/ → /t/, demonstrating the influence of native phonological rules on English pronunciation. These changes occur because certain sounds in English are not present or are pronounced differently in their first languages. The analysis of the Optimality Theory (OT) table highlights the hierarchical structure of constraints that determines the selection of optimal candidates for phonological processes. The analysis also revealed that the learners substitute or simplify sounds based on what is easier to pronounce in their linguistic system. These findings confirm that first language interference significantly affects how young learners acquire English pronunciation.

The application of Generative Phonology and Optimality Theory (OT) provides a robust explanation for learners' phonological errors. These frameworks can inform educators and curriculum designers by offering a theoretical basis for predicting which sounds learners are likely to mispronounce and why. This understanding can lead to more systematic and effective phonological instruction. While this study focuses on segmental features (consonants), future research could investigate how suprasegmental features are influenced by L1 interference and whether they present similar challenges for multilingual learners in Medan.

References

- Abazova, M. M. (2019). Language interference (on the example of the speech of the Kabardino-Circassian Diaspora abroad and the literary Kabardino-Circassian language). *Modern Studies of Social Problems*, 4.
- Abdul, W. A., & Jarinikh, K. (2018). *Phonological Rules, Constraints and Processes A Presentation for a Course in Phonetics and Phonology* PhD Program First Semester. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328412499_Phonological_Rules_Constraints_and_P

rocesses_A_Presentation_for_a_Course_in_Phonetics_and_Phonology_PhD_Program_First_Semester

Asare, T. A. J., & Orfson-Offei, E. (2023). Substitution phonological patterns in the English speech of Ghanaian

children. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 8(1), 100631.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100631>

Baloch, S. S. (2013). L1 (Arabic) Interference in Learning L2 (English): An Analysis of English Spelling Used

by Arabic Speakers at Under graduate Level – A Case Study. *European Scientific Journal* 9(16), pp.226-232. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.org/index.php/esj/article/view/1145/1161>

Carson, L. (2016). *The Sights and Sounds of the Multilingual City*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Chomsky, N., & Halle, M. (1968). *The Sound Pattern of English*. Harper Row.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed).

SAGE Publications.

Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2023). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (26th ed.). SIL International.

Hara, N. T., Siregar, M., Suhery, D., & Rangkuti, R. (2024). Devoicing of Final Voiced Stop Consonants in Indonesia: A Generative and Optimality Theoretic Approach. *Ethical Lingua*, 11(2), 316–331.

<https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.704>.

Kager, R. (2004). *Optimality Theory*. Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, J. J. (2007). What Is Optimality Theory? *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1(4), 260–291.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2007.00018.x>

Mose, E. (2021). Phonological Processes in Ekegusii Borrowing: A Constraint-based Approach. *JL3T (Journal*

of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching), 7(2), 83–100.

<https://doi.org/10.32505/jl3t.v7i2.3233>

Prince, A., & Smolensky, P. (1993). *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*,

10(1–4). <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>

Siregar, F. (2010). Language use and language attitudes in multilingual settings: A case study in Medan, North Sumatra. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 206, 45–62.

Suhery, D., Idami, Z., & Wati, S. (2024). The Phonological Interference of Acehnese in Pronouncing

Indonesian Language. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 12(1), 120.

<https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v12i1.9554>.

Suhery, D., Meutia, C. I., Raza, M. H., & Idami, Z. (2023). Interlingual Interference in Multilingual Students: An Optimality Theory Approach. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 9(3), 275–283.

This page has been intentionally left blank.