

ENGLISH AND INDONESIAN ELISION: A CONTRASTIVE PHONOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Masagus Sulaiman^{1)*}, Indawan Syahri²⁾, Kurnia Saputri³⁾, Mira Tania⁴⁾

^{1),2),3),4)}English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education

Universitas Muhammadiyah Palembang, Indonesia

masagus_sulaiman@um-palembang.ac.id^{1)*}, indawansyahri_ump@yahoo.co.id²⁾,

kurniasaputri93@gmail.com³⁾, miratania08.hm@gmail.com⁴⁾

Abstract

This study examines elision patterns in English and Indonesian through a contrastive analysis, with the aims of figuring out similarities, differences, and implications for teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). A qualitative research design was employed. To collect the data, the researchers used documentation technique, and to analyze the data, descriptive analysis was applied. The results identifies ten similarities in terms of vowel and consonant deletion, occurrence in rapid and informal speech, reduction of articulatory effort, and support for fluent communication and ten differences in the types of sounds deleted, consonant-cluster patterns, stress influence, weak forms, connected speech, and informal word reduction. These differences may create pronunciation and listening difficulties for EFL students. The results also contribute to TEFL by providing a contrastive basis for developing contextualized pronunciation and listening activities that improve students' recognition and production of natural English connected speech.

Keywords: *English elision; Indonesian elision; sound reduction*

©Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris FKIP UM Palembang

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32502/ecj.v10i2.11535>

Introduction

Since this study focuses on language, it is important to first clarify its meaning. Language is a conventional system of symbols that humans use to express and communicate ideas, emotions, and intentions through speech and other forms of signs. These symbols are systematically organized into linguistic units and governed by phonological, morphological, and syntactic rules that shape how meaning is expressed and interpreted within a speech community. Language can be realized through physical forms, such as speech sounds and written symbols, which carry shared meanings and support effective communication in both spoken and written contexts (Evans & Levinson, 2009; Fabbro et al., 2022; Hyman, 2022; Papazian, 2025; Sulaiman et al., 2026)

From the perspectives of linguistics and semiotics, language can be understood as a structured and hierarchical system of interconnected

units, from basic sounds to complex meaningful constructions, which together enable humans to encode and decode experience through speech and writing. As a socially constructed system of conventional signs, language links form and meaning through sounds, letters, or symbols, facilitating communication, coordination, and shared understanding within a community. Language is also a cognitive and communicative mechanism, where its structure is closely connected to human thought processes, guiding how people produce, interpret, and understand meaning. (Shokirova, 2025)

As a foreign language, English plays a crucial role after students' first language, Bahasa Indonesia. Despite its importance, many students encounter difficulties in learning and practicing English pronunciation. This happens because English and Indonesian have different phonetic alphabets. In this context, Indonesian has a direct relationship between spelling and

pronunciation, unlike English. (Abrar et al., 2018; Karlina et al., 2020). However, a variety of students' language backgrounds can also influence phonological transfer from their first language to the target language. (Zen, 2020).

One of the potential learning problems encountered by students in learning English and Indonesian pronunciation is the occurrence of elision. For example, in English, the word *friendship* is commonly pronounced /'frenʃɪp/ rather than /'frendʃɪp/. It happens because the sounds /n/ and /d/ are made in the same place, the alveolar ridge, while /ʃ/ is produced slightly farther back in the mouth. In rapid speech, speakers often move directly from /n/ to /ʃ/ and omit /d/ to make pronunciation easier. Similarly, in Bahasa Indonesia, the word *sudah* is commonly pronounced /udah/ rather than /sudah/. It happens because the sound /s/ requires continuous airflow to be produced. In casual speech, speakers often simplify pronunciation by deleting sounds that are not essential for meaning. Therefore, the initial /s/ in *sudah* can be omitted because listeners can still understand the word from the context.

These problems can be effectively examined through contrastive analysis. Contrastive analysis is a systematic comparison of two languages aimed at identifying similarities and differences and explaining learning difficulties in second or foreign language acquisition (Sukirmiyadi, 2018; Thyab, 2022). Contrastive analysis also refers to a systematic and theory-based approach that compares two languages in order to reveal their structural similarities and differences that may affect language learning. This approach aims to explain the influence of students' first language (L1) on second language (L2) acquisition, anticipate potential learning

difficulties, and provide insights for instructional practices and curriculum development in language education (Khansir & Pakdel, 2019; Nedjar, 2025).

Naturally, contrastive analysis has three main versions, namely: the strong, weak and moderate forms. The strong form is the prime or sole cause of difficulty and error in foreign language learning intruded by the students' native language. The weak form regards the linguist's best knowledge used to account for second language learning difficulties. The moderate form predicts learning difficulties based on error analysis results, particularly in spelling and dictation tasks. (Khansir & Pakdel, 2019).

Furthermore, Al-Khresheh (2016) assumes that contrastive analysis consists of five main steps. First, selection involves choosing the languages to be studied, usually the first language (L1) and the second language (L2). Second, description involves describing the linguistic structures of both languages. Third, comparison examines the similarities and differences between the two languages. Fourth, prediction identifies possible areas of difficulty that students may experience. Finally, verification checks whether the predicted difficulties actually occur in language learning. In conclusion, contrastive analysis is a comparative linguistic approach employed to examine two languages in order to identify learning difficulties and provide pedagogical implications for language instruction.

This study employs contrastive analysis to examine the phonological systems of English and Indonesian elision. Rattanasak (2025) defines elision as a natural phonological process in connected speech in which a phoneme is omitted to make speech more fluent and easier to produce. This process occurs mainly in rapid and casual speech and

follows systematic phonological patterns rather than random sound deletion. By reducing articulatory effort, elision contributes to the natural flow of spoken language. Therefore, understanding elision is important for second-language students because it helps improve both listening comprehension and pronunciation.

In addition, Warner, (2023) says that elision is a part of the broader process of speech reduction in connected speech rather than as simple sound deletion. During spontaneous communication, speakers naturally reduce speech, and listeners use contextual information to identify words even when some sounds are omitted. This view suggests that elision is a regular feature of fluent spoken language and an integral aspect of natural speech production. Like other experts, Bi, et al., (2024) state that elision is essential for spoken language comprehension. This shows that elision is processed together with other connected speech features, while listeners use lexical knowledge and contextual information to interpret phonological variation.

Previous studies have demonstrated that contrastive analysis remains a valuable approach for identifying similarities and differences between languages and explaining potential difficulties experienced by second or foreign language students. Recent empirical studies in second language phonology have shown that students' pronunciation performance is strongly influenced by differences between their first language (L1) and the target language (L2) phonological systems. For example, recent studies on Indonesian EFL students have reported that variations between Indonesian and English sound systems contribute to persistent pronunciation problems, particularly in producing unfamiliar English sounds and phonological

patterns (Akis & Jamilah, 2025; Yulianti et al., 2025). These findings reinforce the importance of contrastive phonological analysis in understanding how L1 phonological characteristics affect English pronunciation learning.

In relation to connected speech, recent phonological studies have emphasized that pronunciation difficulties are not limited to individual sounds but also involve complex speech processes, including sound reduction, assimilation, linking, and elision. Studies on English pronunciation learning have indicated that EFL students often experience difficulties in perceiving and producing naturally occurring speech because connected speech features differ significantly from careful or citation pronunciation forms. Recent research on Indonesian EFL students has also revealed that pronunciation errors are frequently associated with limited awareness of English phonological patterns and the influence of Indonesian phonological structures (Arfiyanti et al., 2026; Marfa et al., 2026). Therefore, understanding phonological reduction processes such as elision becomes essential for improving students' pronunciation awareness and intelligibility.

Furthermore, recent empirical investigations have highlighted that Indonesian students commonly encounter challenges when producing English sounds that do not exist or function differently in Indonesian. Akis & Jamilah (2025) found that Indonesian EFL students experienced difficulties in articulating several English consonants because these sounds are absent from the Indonesian phonological inventory. Similarly, Yulianti, et al., (2025) reported that Indonesian students continued to face problems with English segmental features despite receiving formal English instruction. These findings suggest that systematic

comparison between English and Indonesian phonological systems is necessary, particularly for less explored phenomena such as elision.

However, although recent studies have increasingly investigated Indonesian EFL students' pronunciation difficulties, most research has concentrated on segmental errors, consonant production, vowel difficulties, and general phonological interference. Recent empirical studies have rarely examined elision as a specific connected speech phenomenon, and even fewer studies have compared elision patterns between English and Indonesian. Consequently, there remains a research gap concerning how elision operates in the two languages, including its types, phonological environments, and possible implications for English pronunciation learning among Indonesian students.

In response to this research gap, the present study introduces a novel contribution by conducting a systematic contrastive phonological analysis of elision in English and Indonesian. Unlike previous studies that mainly investigate pronunciation problems or phonological errors from a single-language perspective, this study integrates contrastive analysis and elision analysis to explore similarities, differences, patterns, and functions of elision across the two languages. The results are expected to contribute new insights into cross-linguistic phonological processes and provide pedagogical implications for pronunciation teaching in Indonesian EFL contexts.

Research Method

This study utilizes a qualitative research design to examine the realization of elision in English and Indonesian through a contrastive phonological analysis. It is employed because the investigation aims to

interpret and explain phonological patterns, sound reduction mechanisms, and language-specific characteristics based on linguistic evidence rather than statistical measurement. Such an approach enables an in-depth examination of how elision operates within different phonological systems and how these differences may contribute to challenges in foreign language pronunciation learning (Dahal, 2025; Rustamana et al., 2024).

The research data were collected through documentation technique which derived from two categories of sources: primary and secondary sources. The primary sources included authoritative linguistic references that provide theoretical foundations and descriptive accounts of English and Indonesian phonological systems, such as *A Course in Phonetics* (Ladefoged & Johnson, 2022) and *Fonologi Bahasa Indonesia* (Muslich, 2018). These references were used to establish the fundamental concepts related to speech sounds, phonological patterns, and sound processes in both languages. The secondary sources consisted of peer-reviewed national and international studies focusing on phonological processes, connected speech, speech reduction, and elision phenomena in English and Indonesian (Warner, 2023; Rattanasak, 2025). The selected sources were determined based on their relevance to the research focus and their contribution to explaining cross-linguistic phonological variation between English and Indonesian.

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive analysis through several stages or procedures, namely: identification, classification, comparison, interpretation, and conclusion drawing. First, the forms of elision in English and Indonesian were identified and classified based on their phonological features, articulatory processes, and contexts of

occurrence. The identified patterns were then compared to determine the similarities and differences between the two languages. Finally, the results were interpreted using a contrastive phonological framework to explain their implications for pronunciation learning and EFL instruction. This analysis provides a deeper understanding of how

elision operates in English and Indonesian phonological systems.

Results and Discussion

This study examines elision in English and Indonesian, focusing on their similarities, differences, and possible difficulties for EFL students. The English elision patterns are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. English Elision Patterns

No.	Pattern	Explanation	Instances	Phonetic Transcription
1	/t/ elision	/t/ is omitted, especially in consonant clusters	next day	/neks dei/
2	/d/ elision	/d/ may be omitted in a consonant cluster	old man	/əʊl mæn/
3	/k/ elision	/k/ may be omitted in difficult consonant sequences	asked	/ɑ:st/
4	/p/ elision	/p/ can be omitted in complex consonant clusters	empty	/'emti/
5	/g/ elision	/g/ may be omitted in some consonant sequences	sign language	/saɪn læŋgwɪdʒ/
6	Schwa /ə/ elision	An unstressed vowel may be omitted in rapid speech	family	/'fæmli/
7	/h/ elision	/h/ may be omitted in unstressed function words	tell him	/tel ɪm/
8	Consonant-cluster reduction	One consonant is deleted from a cluster	just one	/dʒʌs wʌn/
9	Final consonant elision	A final consonant may be omitted before another consonant	and then	/ən ðen/
10	Weak-form reduction and elision	Unstressed function words may lose sounds in connected speech	going to	/gəʊnə/

Table 1 shows several patterns of elision that occur in English, particularly in connected and informal speech. Elision refers to the omission of a sound in a particular phonological environment. In English, the omitted sound can be either a consonant or a vowel. Consonant elision commonly involves sounds such as /t/ and /d/, especially when they occur in consonant clusters. For example, the /t/ in *next day* may not be clearly pronounced, resulting in a pronunciation such as /neks dei/. Similarly, the /d/ in *old man* may be omitted and realized approximately as /əʊl mæn/. These forms help speakers produce difficult consonant sequences

more easily and maintain the natural rhythm of connected speech.

It also shows that elision can involve unstressed vowels, particularly the schwa /ə/. In fluent speech, an unstressed vowel may be omitted when its deletion does not affect the meaning or recognition of the word. For example, *family* may be pronounced as /'fæmli/ rather than /'fæməli/. This type of vowel elision reduces the number of syllables and allows speakers to produce words more efficiently. In addition, /h/ may be omitted when it occurs at the beginning of an unstressed function word. For example, *tell him* may be pronounced as /telɪm/. Such reduction is common in

natural connected speech, particularly when the function word is not stressed.

It further presents consonant-cluster reduction, in which one consonant in a sequence may be omitted. For example, *just one* may be pronounced approximately as /dʒʌs wʌn/. Final consonant elision may also occur when a word ending in a consonant is followed by another consonant, as in *and then*, which may be realized as /ən ðen/. These examples demonstrate that the phonological environment surrounding a sound can influence whether elision occurs.

In this context, English elision is closely related to connected speech,

speech rate, stress, and ease of articulation. Speakers may omit certain sounds when pronunciation would otherwise require more complex articulatory movements. However, elision is not always obligatory and may vary according to speaking style, context, and individual speakers. Therefore, English elision can be viewed as an important phonological process that contributes to the fluency and naturalness of spoken English. After examining the patterns of elision in English, the following section discusses Indonesian elision, as illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2. Indonesian Elision Patterns

No.	Pattern	Explanation	Instances	Phonetic Transcription
1	Vowel elision	An unstressed vowel may be omitted in rapid or informal speech.	<i>sudah</i> → <i>suda</i>	/suda/
2	/h/ elision	/h/ may be omitted in certain informal pronunciations.	<i>sudah</i> → <i>suda</i>	/suda/
3	/ə/ (schwa) elision	The schwa may be reduced or omitted in rapid speech.	<i>terima</i> → <i>trima</i>	/trima/
4	Initial vowel elision	An initial vowel may be reduced or omitted in certain informal speech forms.	<i>sudah</i> → <i>dah</i>	/dah/
5	Consonant elision	A consonant may be omitted in casual or rapid pronunciation.	<i>tidak</i> → <i>tak</i>	/tak/
6	Syllable reduction	A syllable may be omitted, producing a shorter form.	<i>saja</i> → <i>ja</i>	/dʒa/
7	Word-final sound elision	A final sound may be omitted in informal pronunciation.	<i>sampai</i> → <i>sampe</i>	/sampe/
8	Informal word-form reduction	A commonly used word may have a shortened conversational form.	<i>bagaimana</i> → <i>gimana</i>	/gimana/
9	Function-word reduction	Frequently used grammatical words may be shortened in casual speech.	<i>sudah</i> → <i>udah</i>	/udah/
10	Phrase-level elision	Sounds or syllables may be omitted when words occur together in fluent speech.	<i>tidak usah</i> → <i>tak usah</i>	/tak usah/

Table 2 presents several patterns of elision found in Indonesian, particularly in informal and conversational speech. The patterns include vowel elision, consonant elision, schwa deletion, initial sound deletion, syllable reduction, and the reduction of frequently used words or expressions. These patterns show that Indonesian speakers may omit certain

sounds or syllables when speaking quickly or informally.

It shows that vowel elision can occur when an unstressed vowel is omitted in rapid speech. For example, *terima* may be pronounced as *trima* in informal speech, in which the schwa is not clearly realized. Consonant elision can also occur in commonly used words. For example, *sudah* may be reduced to

udah or *dah* in casual conversation. Similarly, *tidak* may be shortened to *tak* in certain contexts. These forms illustrate how frequently used words can undergo sound reduction in everyday communication.

It further shows that Indonesian elision may involve the reduction of syllables or parts of words. For instance, *bagaimana* is commonly reduced to *gimana* in informal conversation. Such reductions make speech shorter and more efficient. However, these forms are generally associated with informal spoken Indonesian and may not be appropriate in formal contexts.

In this case, Indonesian elision is influenced by speech rate, speaking style, and the frequency of particular words. Speakers tend to reduce or omit sounds when communicating informally or rapidly. Therefore, Indonesian elision contributes to more fluent and efficient spoken communication and provides an important basis for comparing Indonesian and English elision patterns in this study. After examining Indonesian elision patterns, the following section discusses the similarities found between English and Indonesian elision patterns as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. The Similarities between English and Indonesian Elisions

No.	Similarity	English	Indonesian
1	Both involve sound deletion	Sounds such as /t/, /d/, /h/, or /ə/ may be omitted.	Vowels, consonants, or /ə/ may be omitted.
2	Vowel elision occurs	Unstressed schwa /ə/ may be deleted, e.g., <i>family</i> → /'fæmli/.	Unstressed vowels may be deleted, e.g., <i>terima</i> → <i>trima</i> .
3	Consonant elision occurs	/t/ and /d/ may be omitted in connected speech, e.g., <i>next day</i> → /neks deɪ/.	Consonants may be omitted in informal forms, e.g., <i>sudah</i> → <i>udah</i> .
4	Reduction occurs in fluent speech	Elision is common in rapid and connected speech.	Elision commonly occurs in rapid and informal speech.
5	Speech rate influences elision	Faster speech can encourage sound deletion.	Faster speech can encourage sound or syllable deletion.
6	Ease of articulation is important	Sounds may be omitted to simplify difficult consonant sequences.	Sounds or syllables may be reduced to make pronunciation easier.
7	Informal speech encourages reduction	Elision is more frequent in casual conversation than careful speech.	Reduced forms are especially common in casual conversation.
8	Both affect naturalness and fluency	Elision contributes to fluent and natural connected speech.	Elision makes informal spoken Indonesian more efficient and fluent.
9	Phonological context affects occurrence	Elision depends on surrounding sounds, stress, and word position.	Elision depends on the surrounding sounds, word position, and speech context.
10	Elision is not always obligatory	Many forms vary according to speech style and context.	Many reduced forms vary according to formality and context.

Table 3 shows that English and Indonesian have several similarities in their patterns of elision. First, both languages involve the deletion of sounds in certain phonological environments. In English, consonants such as /t/ and /d/ and vowels such as /ə/ may be omitted, while Indonesian also shows the deletion or reduction of vowels and consonants in informal speech. This indicates that both

languages use elision as a way of simplifying pronunciation.

Second, both languages show vowel elision, particularly involving unstressed vowels. In English, the schwa /ə/ may be omitted, as in *family* → /'fæmli/. Similarly, Indonesian may omit an unstressed vowel, as in *terima* → *trima*. In both cases, the deletion reduces the number of sounds or syllables and makes pronunciation more efficient.

Third, both languages show consonant elision. English may omit /t/ or /d/ in connected speech, such as *next day* → /neks dei/. Indonesian may also omit consonants in informal forms, such as *sudah* → *udah*. In both languages, consonant deletion can make the transition between sounds easier.

Fourth, elision is commonly associated with rapid and informal speech in both languages. Speakers tend to reduce or omit sounds when speaking quickly or casually. In careful or formal speech, these sounds are more likely to be fully pronounced. Therefore, speech rate and speaking style influence the occurrence of elision in both English and Indonesian. Fifth, elision helps reduce articulatory effort. When speakers omit certain sounds, they can produce words and phrases more easily and quickly. This process contributes to smoother and more fluent speech in both languages.

Finally, elision in both languages is influenced by the phonological context. The sounds surrounding the potential deletion, word position, speech rate, and level of formality can affect whether elision occurs. Thus, although English and Indonesian have different phonological systems, they share a similar tendency to reduce sounds in order to facilitate natural and efficient spoken communication. It means that the comparison shows that English and Indonesian elision have a common functional role in terms of simplifying pronunciation and supporting fluent speech, especially in rapid and informal communication. After examining the similarities between English and Indonesian elision patterns, the following section discusses the differences found between English and Indonesian elision patterns as stated in Table 4.

Table 4. The Differences between English and Indonesian Elisions

No.	Aspect	English Elision	Indonesian Elision
1	Main pattern	Commonly involves consonant deletion, especially /t/ and /d/, and schwa /ə/ deletion.	More often involves vowel/schwa deletion and reduction of parts of frequently used words.
2	Consonant deletion	Frequently occurs in consonant clusters, e.g., <i>next day</i> → /neks dei/.	Consonant deletion is more commonly found in informal shortened forms, e.g., <i>sudah</i> → <i>udah</i> .
3	Vowel deletion	Particularly involves unstressed schwa /ə/, e.g., <i>family</i> → /'fæmli/.	Can involve unstressed vowels, e.g., <i>terima</i> → <i>trima</i> .
4	Consonant clusters	Elision is strongly associated with complex consonant clusters.	Indonesian generally has fewer complex consonant clusters, so cluster-based elision is less prominent.
5	Connected speech	Elision is a well-established feature of English connected speech.	Elision is more strongly associated with informal and conversational speech.
6	Function words	Elision may occur in unstressed function words, e.g., <i>tell him</i> → /tel ɪm/.	Reduction commonly occurs in frequently used words, e.g., <i>sudah</i> → <i>udah</i> .
7	Word reduction	English reduction often occurs while the original word remains recognizable in connected speech.	Indonesian frequently shows shortened colloquial forms, such as <i>bagaimana</i> → <i>gimana</i> .
8	Stress	Stress plays an important role; unstressed sounds are more likely to be reduced or deleted.	Stress is less central to the system because Indonesian has a less strongly stress-based rhythm.
9	Phonological motivation	Often motivated by the difficulty of producing adjacent consonants and maintaining fluent connected speech.	Often associated with speech economy, informal pronunciation, and shortening of frequent expressions.

10	Formality	Occurs in both casual and fluent connected speech, although it is more noticeable in informal pronunciation.	More strongly associated with informal or colloquial language than formal pronunciation.
-----------	------------------	--	--

Table 4 shows ten differences between English and Indonesian elision patterns. The first difference concerns the types of sounds that are commonly omitted. In English, elision frequently involves consonants, particularly /t/ and /d/, as well as unstressed vowels such as schwa /ə/. These deletions commonly occur in connected speech and consonant clusters. In Indonesian, however, elision more commonly appears as vowel reduction, consonant deletion, or the shortening of frequently used words in informal speech. The second difference concerns consonant clusters. English allows relatively complex consonant clusters, and therefore elision often occurs to simplify these sequences. For example, *next day* may be pronounced as /neks dei/ through the omission of /t/. Indonesian has a relatively simpler consonant structure, so cluster-based elision is less prominent. Indonesian elision is more often related to the reduction of sounds or syllables in commonly used words.

Another difference found in word reduction. English elision generally occurs within connected speech while the word remains relatively close to its full pronunciation. Indonesian, in contrast, has many commonly used informal shortened forms. For example, *sudah* may become *udah*, and *bagaimana* may become *gimana*. These forms are strongly associated with conversational Indonesian and may be less appropriate in formal contexts. The role of stress also differs between the two languages. English has a stronger stress-based rhythm, so unstressed sounds, particularly schwa, are more likely to undergo reduction or deletion. Indonesian does not rely on lexical stress to the same extent as English. Consequently, Indonesian elision is less directly related to stress and is more

strongly influenced by speech rate, informality, and frequently used expressions.

Finally, the two languages differ in the phonological contexts in which elision occurs. English elision is strongly connected with consonant clusters, weak forms, and connected-speech processes. Indonesian elision is more commonly associated with informal pronunciation and the shortening of familiar words or expressions. Therefore, although both languages use elision to make speech more efficient, the specific phonological environments and patterns in which elision occurs are different. In this way, English elision is more strongly associated with connected speech, consonant clusters, and stress-related reduction, whereas Indonesian elision is more closely associated with informal speech, vowel reduction, and the shortening of frequently used words.

Conclusion

This analysis identifies ten similarities and ten differences in elision patterns between English and Indonesian. The results showed that both languages employ elision to reduce or omit sounds, particularly in rapid and informal speech. However, they differ in the types of sounds commonly deleted and the phonological contexts in which elision occurs. It also indicates that both English and Indonesian exhibit vowel and consonant elision. In both languages, sound deletion can facilitate pronunciation by reducing articulatory effort and supporting fluent speech. In English, elision commonly involves /t/, /d/, and the unstressed vowel /ə/, particularly in connected speech and consonant clusters. Indonesian also shows vowel and consonant reduction, especially in informal speech, as

illustrated by *terima* → *trima* and *sudah* → *udah*.

Despite these similarities, the dominant patterns differ across the two languages. English elision is more closely associated with connected speech, consonant clusters, weak forms, and stress-related reduction. Indonesian elision is more commonly associated with informal speech and the reduction of frequently used words and expressions. These differences may present challenges for Indonesian EFL students, particularly in recognizing reduced forms in natural English speech, producing complex consonant sequences, and interpreting the deletion of /t/, /d/, and /ə/. Students may also pronounce all written sounds or transfer Indonesian reduction patterns to English in inappropriate contexts.

The results have practical implications for Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). The similarities can provide a useful starting point for introducing the concept of elision, while the differences can help teachers address English-specific pronunciation difficulties. Pronunciation instruction should therefore incorporate authentic connected speech, listening practice, repetition, shadowing, and contextualized dialogue. Teachers should also explicitly address the relationship between elision, stress, speech rate, weak forms, and consonant clusters.

In conclusion, English and Indonesian share the functional purpose of elision in facilitating easier, faster, and more fluent speech, but they differ in their specific phonological patterns and contexts of occurrence. A contrastive understanding of these patterns can help teachers anticipate students' pronunciation and listening difficulties and develop more targeted instructional activities. Thus, the analysis provides a useful foundation for

incorporating elision into EFL pronunciation instruction and developing students' ability to recognize and produce natural English connected speech.

Reference

- Abrar, M., Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Asyraf, F., Makmur, & Marzulina, L. (2018). If our English isn't a language, what is it? Indonesian EFL student teachers' challenges in speaking English. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(1), 129. <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss1/9>
- Akis, M. I. A., & Jamilah, J. (2025). EFL consonant pronunciation: A PRAAT & CALD-based study of Indonesian learners. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 19(1), 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v19i1.133711>
- Al-Khresheh, M. H. (2016). A review study of contrastive analysis theory. *International Journal of Advances in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(6), 330–338. <https://doi.org/10.20474/jahss-2.6.5>
- Arfiyanti, R., Rosyidah, N., Aniuranti, A., & Haryani, N. (2026). Analysing the root causes of English pronunciation difficulties among Indonesian EFL learners. *Economics, Social, and Humanities Journal*, 5(2), 94–111. <https://doi.org/10.65669/esochum.v5i2.652>
- Bi, H., Zare, S., Kania, U., & Yan, R. (2024). A systematic review of studies on connected speech processing: Trends, key findings, and implications. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1–13.

- <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1056827>
- Dahal, N. (2025). Qualitative data analysis: Reflections, procedures, and some points for consideration. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 10, 1669578. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2025.1669578>
- Evans, N., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 44, e2. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X2000032X>
- Fabbro, F., Fabbro, A., & Crescentini, C. (2022). The nature and function of languages, 7(4), 01-10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages704303>
- Hyman, L. M. (2022). Phonological theory and the structure of sound systems. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 53(2), 235–278. https://doi.org/10.1162/ling_a_00432
- Karlina, Y., Rahman, A., & Chowdhury, R. (2020). Designing phonetic alphabets for Bahasa Indonesia (PABI) for the teaching intelligible English pronunciation in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(3), 724–732. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23223>
- Khansir, A. A., & Pakdel, F. (2019). Contrastive analysis hypothesis and second language learning. *Journal of ELT Research*, 4(1), 35–43. https://doi.org/10.22236/JER_Vo14Issue1pp35-43
- Ladefoged, P., & Johnson, K. (2022). *A course in phonetics* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Marfa, M. Q., Rahayu, S., & Syahira, S. (2026). Indonesian learners' phonological errors in English pronunciation: A literature review. *Journal Sains Student Research*, 4 (4), 900-914. <https://doi.org/10.61722/jssr.v4i4.11503>
- Muslich, M. (2018). *Fonologi bahasa Indonesia: Tinjauan deskriptif sistem bunyi bahasa Indonesia*. Bumi Aksara.
- Nedjar, D. (2025). Contrastive linguistics for language acquisition and learning: An analytical study. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*, 2(46), 1-9. [https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.2\(46\)](https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.2(46))
- Papazian, E. (2025). The linguistic sign and the subsystems of language. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 13(1), 11–18. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20251301.13>
- Rattanasak, S. (2025). *Cogent Education Phonological processes in English connected speech: implications for L2 speech learning and communication*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2472474>
- Rustamana, A., Adillah, P. M., Maharani, N. K., & Fayyadh, F. A. (2024). Qualitative research methods. *Indonesian Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Science and Technology*, 2(6), 919–930. <https://doi.org/10.55927/marcopolo.v2i6.9907>

- Shokirova, K. (2025). The semiotic system and structure of language. *Emergent: Journal of Educational Discoveries and Lifelong Learning*, 6(3), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.47134/emergent.v4i1.65>
- Sukirmiyadi. (2018). The role of contrastive analysis in translation study. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 6(9), 30–34. <https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0609004>
- Sulaiman, M., Syahri, I., Saputri, K., & Tania, M. (2026). Sound change mechanisms in English and Indonesian: A contrastive phonological approach to EFL instruction. *English Community Journal*, 10 (1), 29-40. <https://doi.org/10.32502/ecj.v10i1.10926>
- Thyab, R. A. (2022). A contrastive analysis of relative clause grammar in both Arabic and English. *Rimak International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 231–237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.47832/2717-8293.15.17>
- Warner, N. (2023). Advancements of phonetics in the 21st century: Theoretical and empirical issues of spoken word recognition in phonetic research. *Journal of Phonetics*, 101, 101275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2023.101275>
- Yulianti, L. D., Marhum, M., & Kamaruddin, A. (2025). Pronunciation problems of English segmental sounds encountered by EFL learners of English Education Study Program. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha*, 13(1), 124–139. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v13i1.86838>
- Zen, E. L. (2020). Role of regional language background and speech styles on the production of voice onset time (VOT) in English among Indonesian multilingualism. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 359–368. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i2.28604>