

Analysis of the Pronunciation of French Sounds of the Indonesian Minister of Foreign Affairs: A Phonological Study

Atha Zamrain Husein*, Bernadus Wahyudi Joko Santoso, Siti Ayu Masthuroh

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Email: thazein99_@students.unnes.ac.id*, wahyudifr@mail.unnes.ac.id,

sitiayumasthuroh@mail.unnes.ac.id

Keywords:

phonology, pronunciation,
interference, French language,
diplomacy

ABSTRACT

French pronunciation accuracy is an important aspect of international communication, particularly for diplomats and state officials who use French as a language of diplomacy. Differences between Indonesian and French phonological systems may cause pronunciation interference, affecting the clarity and professionalism of spoken messages. This study aims to identify and describe the types of French pronunciation errors produced by the Indonesian Minister of Foreign Affairs in a public speech. This research employed a qualitative descriptive method. The data were obtained from a French-language speech video uploaded on YouTube and analyzed through phonological transcription using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) to compare the actual pronunciation with the standard French pronunciation. The results indicate eight pronunciation errors involving four major patterns: addition of final consonants, vowel substitution, sound deletion, and inappropriate nasalization. The findings show that the errors are mainly caused by Indonesian phonological interference and the tendency to pronounce French words based on their written forms. Several errors, such as *accord* pronounced with an additional final consonant, *dans* with an unnecessary [s] sound, and *Indonésie* with incorrect nasal vowel realization, demonstrate difficulties in mastering French phonological rules. These errors may influence intelligibility and semantic accuracy in diplomatic communication. In conclusion, mastery of French vocabulary alone is insufficient; effective diplomatic communication requires specific pronunciation training focusing on French phonological features, particularly silent consonants, nasal vowels, schwa, and grapheme-to-phoneme correspondence.

INTRODUCTION

Language as a means of communication plays an important role in daily human life. Apart from conveying information, ideas, and feelings, language also helps a person to build relationships between individuals and groups. Languages in human life are divided into two, namely the first language/mother tongue (L1) and the second/secondary language. Hernawati (2017:85) said that mother tongue is the language that a child acquires when learning to speak by going through a natural learning process. Meanwhile, the second language (L2), said by Arnita (2024), is a language learned when you already have a first language. However, there are also terms for third, fourth, and so on to refer to other languages acquired when learning a second language. Additional languages other than the mother tongue (L1), are usually foreign languages, i.e. languages outside the national language spoken by the speakers.

Second/secondary languages (L2), third languages (L3), fourth languages (L4), and so on are often understood as functional communication skills with the concept of their application in the professional field. A person who is engaged in the professional world, is

often required to be able to master a secondary language or even more, in order to support professionalism in the realm of work. For example, someone with a background in international trade, tourism or hospitality, to diplomats and foreign ministers. For a foreign minister, mastery of foreign languages is a fundamental competence, especially in carrying out the function of state representation in various international forums and establishing good relations between countries. Language, with one of its functions as a bridge of communication, is a weapon to be able to strengthen a country's position on the global stage. French has an important and significant role as one of the languages of diplomacy that is still widely used in various international arenas. Therefore, accuracy/accuracy and fluency in language, especially the accuracy of pronunciation, are crucial aspects that reflect the professionalism and trust brought by a representative of the country.

This research focuses on how the Indonesian Minister of Foreign Affairs pronounces French sounds in a public speech circulating on social media, precisely YouTube. As a figure representing the country's diplomacy, every statement delivered carries a large and influential symbolic and political impact. When a speaker of a secondary (L2) or foreign language comes from a mother tongue (L1) with a different phonological system such as Indonesian and French, his pronunciation is often influenced by phonological interference. Based on preliminary observations, a number of key French phrases in the speech appear to indicate a rather striking inaccuracy of the standard phonological rules of the French language, especially in the production of certain vowels and consonants.

There are several previous studies with similar topics that are the reference for this study. Nugroho et al (2022) in their research entitled "Analysis of the Sound Pronunciation of French-Language Product Brands in French Literature Students of Semarang State University" focused on how respondents pronounced French-language product brands. In the study, phonological interference such as changes, additions, and reductions of sound were found. Furthermore, a study entitled "Pronunciation Errors of French Vowel and Semi-Vowel Sounds in Class XI SMA N 9 Bandar Lampung" by Rageh (2019), found that the dominant errors lie in the oral vowels of the vowels [y], vowels [ø], and vowels [œ]. In nasal vowels, the fault lies in the [ɛ̃] sound, the [œ̃] sound, as well as the [ã] sound. While in semi-vowels, the error is found in the sound [j]. It is known that the causes of these errors come from interlingual, intralingual, and learning system factors.

However, most previous research on relevant topics focused on French learners at the secondary school or college level. For this reason, this research is a hadith to conduct a phonological study on the speech of a high-profile state official. This analysis is not only relevant for linguistics, but also has important implications in the context of public diplomacy, where the regulation of oral communication by well-known figures can affect perceptions and diplomatic relations between countries. This research also tries to focus on answering the question of what types of French sound pronunciation errors. Then, this study also aims to identify and describe the types of French sound pronunciation errors made by the Indonesian Minister of Foreign Affairs.

METHOD

This research is qualitative descriptive. Qualitative research according to (Murdiyanto, 2020:19) is research that focuses knowledge on problems in life, both social and based on

reality. Meanwhile, according to (Gunawan, 2021:3), the qualitative approach seeks to understand and interpret the meaning of an event of human behavior interaction in certain circumstances from the perspective of the researcher. In other words, qualitative research will discuss an event of interaction that is always carried out between humans and their lives, one example is on the global stage such as international forums. The main source of research data comes from YouTube videos uploaded on @SauDiplomatKampung account, and other data sources are obtained from several journal articles or books relevant to this topic. The data is an additional data source used by researchers. The data collection technique uses the documentation method. Documentation study is one of the techniques to collect data by analyzing documents, images, and works (Nilamsari, 2014:181). Based on the above definition, it can be concluded that documentation is in the form of data taken from books, photos, videos and other relevant data that are used as sources of information. So the documentation technique is in accordance with the topic being discussed because it takes the source of data through video. After the data is collected and then analyzed, then the conclusion can be found. The aspect studied in this study is errors in French pronunciation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following is the result of the French pronunciation research of the Indonesian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sugiono based on a short video on social media YouTube (YouTube Shorts).

Table 1. Results of French Pronunciation Errors

No	Fonemik	Fonetik Kesalahan Pelafalan	Fonetik Pelafalan Seharusnya
1.	Accord	[akɔrd]	[akɔr]
2.	Entre	[ãntre]	[ãntɾə]
3.	Le	[le]	[lə]
4.	Gouvernement	[gɔvɛʁnəmã]	[guvɛʁnəmã]
5.	Indonésie	[indɔnezj]	[ẽdɔnezj]
6.	Française	[fɾãsɛ]	[fɾãsɛz]
7.	Dans	[dãs]	[dã]
8.	Domaine	[dɔmã]	[dɔmɛn]

There were eight French word pronunciation errors identified in Foreign Minister Sugiono's French utterances. The errors do not appear as random slips, but as systematic phonological deviations that can be grouped into four patterns: addition of final consonants, inaccurate vowel realization, deletion of sounds that should be pronounced, and inappropriate nasalization. In phonological terms, these patterns show the influence of the first language sound system on the production of a foreign language. This condition is consistent with contrastive analysis, which explains that speakers tend to transfer familiar phonetic and phonological habits from their first language when producing a second or foreign language (Lado, 1957; Odlin, 1989). In this case, Indonesian phonology influences the way French spelling is converted into sound, especially because Indonesian has a more transparent relationship between letters and sounds than French (Chaer, 2014; Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2014).

The first error occurs in the word *accord*. The standard French pronunciation is [akɔʁ], but the observed pronunciation is [akɔrd]. The addition of the final consonant [d] indicates orthographic interference because the final letter d is visible in writing but silent in standard French pronunciation. French has a number of final consonants that are not pronounced, depending on the lexical item and phonological environment. This differs from Indonesian, where written consonants at the end of words are generally pronounced more consistently. The production of [akɔrd] therefore suggests that the speaker relies strongly on spelling rather than on the French sound system. Similar cases of sound addition were also reported by Nugroho et al. (2022), who found that Indonesian learners often pronounce French words according to their written form.

The second error appears in the word *entre*. The expected pronunciation is [ɑ̃trə], while the observed form is [ɑ̃tre]. This error involves the replacement of the schwa [ə] with the tense vowel [e]. In French phonology, the schwa or *e caduc* has a special status because it may be weakened or deleted depending on position, rhythm, and speech style (Léon, 1992; Valdman, 1993). The realization of [ə] as [e] changes the phonetic quality of the word and may make the word sound closer to another French lexical form. In diplomatic speech, such a shift can be problematic because small changes in vowel quality may affect intelligibility, especially for native or proficient French listeners (Derwing & Munro, 2005).

The third error is found in the article *le*. The expected form is [lə], but the speaker pronounces it as [le]. This case is closely related to the previous error because both involve the difficulty of producing the French schwa. In Indonesian, the vowel written as *e* may be pronounced in several ways, but speakers often do not treat vowel reduction as a phonemic issue in the same way as French. As a result, the article *le* may be pronounced with a clearer and more closed vowel [e]. This pronunciation may cause confusion with *les* [le], the plural article in French. The contrast between *le* and *les* shows that vowel quality has a grammatical function. Therefore, the error is not merely phonetic; it may also affect grammatical interpretation (Crystal, 2008; Walter, 1988).

The fourth error occurs in *gouvernement*. The observed pronunciation [gɔvɛʁnəmɑ̃] differs from the expected pronunciation [guvɛʁnəmɑ̃]. The problem lies in the realization of the grapheme *ou*, which in French is normally pronounced as [u], not [ɔ]. This error again shows the influence of orthographic reading. In French, the relationship between grapheme and phoneme is less direct than in Indonesian. A speaker who has not fully internalized French grapheme to phoneme rules may treat *ou* as a sequence that resembles Indonesian spelling. From an articulatory perspective, [u] is a high back rounded vowel, while [ɔ] is a mid back rounded vowel. The shift from [u] to [ɔ] changes tongue height and creates a pronunciation that sounds noticeably nonstandard (Ladefoged, 2005; Ladefoged & Johnson, 2015).

The fifth error is found in *Indonésie*. The expected pronunciation is [ɛ̃dɔnezj], but the observed pronunciation is [indɔnezj]. This error occurs because the nasal vowel [ɛ̃] is replaced by the oral vowel sequence [in]. French nasal vowels are difficult for Indonesian speakers because Indonesian does not use nasal vowels as independent phonemic units. Indonesian speakers generally produce nasal quality through nasal consonants such as [m], [n], or [ŋ], not through vowel nasalization. This difference explains why the speaker tends to pronounce the written form in as [in] rather than as [ɛ̃]. Rageh (2019) also found that nasal vowels are among the most frequent sources of error among Indonesian learners of French.

The sixth error appears in *française*. The standard pronunciation is [fʁɑ̃sɛz], while the observed pronunciation is [fʁɑ̃sɛ]. In this case, the final consonant [z] is omitted. This differs from the word *accord* and *dans*, where an unnecessary final consonant is added. The error shows that the speaker has not consistently mastered which final consonants are silent and which must be pronounced in French. The word *française* requires final [z] because the written *se* signals a voiced final consonant in this lexical form. If the [z] is omitted, the pronunciation loses one of its expected phonetic features. This finding supports the view that foreign language pronunciation requires lexical familiarity as well as phonological awareness (Best & Tyler, 2007; Flege, 1995).

The seventh error occurs in *dans*. The expected pronunciation is [dɑ̃], but the observed pronunciation is [dɑ̃s]. The addition of final [s] makes the word sound similar to *danse*, which means dance. This error has a direct semantic impact because *dans* is a preposition meaning in or within, while *danse* is a noun or verb related to dancing. The problem arises from the tendency to pronounce the final written *s*, even though it is silent in the standard pronunciation of *dans*. In public diplomatic communication, this kind of error may distract listeners and reduce the precision of the message. Pronunciation accuracy is therefore important not only for aesthetic fluency, but also for semantic clarity (Munro & Derwing, 1995; Roach, 2009).

The eighth error is found in *domaine*. The expected pronunciation is [dɔ̃mɛn], but the observed pronunciation is [dɔ̃mɑ̃]. This case shows inappropriate nasalization. The final *aine* in *domaine* should be realized as an oral vowel sequence ending in [ɛn], not as the nasal vowel [ɑ̃]. The speaker appears to generalize the presence of nasal vowels in French and applies nasalization to a word that does not require it. This indicates an intralingual factor, namely overgeneralization of a rule within the target language. Interference does not always come from the first language; it can also emerge when a learner applies a partially learned rule too broadly (Ellis, 1994; Brown, 2007).

Overall, the findings show that the dominant problem is not vocabulary selection, but phonological control. The speaker can identify and use French words in a diplomatic context, yet several sounds are produced through Indonesian phonological habits and spelling based assumptions. This supports the argument that pronunciation competence is a specific component of communicative competence. A speaker may know the lexical meaning of a word, but communication can still be disturbed when the word is pronounced with inaccurate segmental features (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Derwing & Munro, 2005).

The errors can also be understood through the concept of marked sounds. Several French sounds, especially [ʁ], [ə], [u] in the grapheme *ou*, and nasal vowels such as [ɛ̃] and [ɑ̃], require articulatory settings that are not dominant in Indonesian. When a target language contains unfamiliar sounds, learners often replace them with the closest sounds available in their first language phonological inventory. This process explains the replacement of [ɛ̃] with [in] and the shift from [u] to [ɔ]. In second language phonology, this phenomenon is often associated with perceptual assimilation, where listeners interpret foreign sounds through categories already established in their first language (Best & Tyler, 2007; Flege, 1995).

The data further indicate that orthography plays a strong role in the pronunciation errors. The words *accord* and *dans* show clear evidence of reading based pronunciation because the final letters *d* and *s* are pronounced even though they are silent in standard French. *Gouvernement* also reflects the same pattern because the grapheme *ou* is not realized as [u].

For Indonesian speakers, this tendency is understandable because Indonesian spelling is relatively phonemic. However, French requires a different reading strategy. The speaker must recognize that written letters do not always correspond directly to pronounced segments. Without such awareness, the written form may become a source of phonological error rather than a guide to correct pronunciation (Walter, 1988; Valdman, 1993).

From the perspective of diplomatic communication, the most serious errors are those that create potential semantic ambiguity. The pronunciation of *dans* as [dãs] may be heard as *danse*, and *le* as [le] may be interpreted as *les*. *Entre* pronounced [ãntre] may also create ambiguity because the vowel quality no longer corresponds to the expected form. In ordinary informal interaction, listeners may infer meaning from context. In diplomatic speech, however, every lexical item carries symbolic and institutional weight. A mispronounced word can be perceived as lack of preparation, limited linguistic competence, or reduced sensitivity to the language of the host country. For this reason, phonological accuracy becomes part of professional credibility in international communication (Crystal, 2008; Derwing & Munro, 2005).

These findings are in line with previous research on Indonesian learners of French. Nugroho et al. (2022) found that learners often add, omit, or replace sounds when pronouncing French product names. Rageh (2019) also reported that French oral vowels, nasal vowels, and semi vowels are frequent sources of error. The present study extends those findings by showing that similar phonological problems can also appear in the speech of a public official, not only among students. This suggests that French pronunciation difficulties are not limited to classroom contexts. They can also emerge in formal public communication when speakers do not receive specific pronunciation training.

Based on the analysis, pronunciation training for diplomats and public officials should focus on three practical areas. First, auditory discrimination training is needed so that speakers can hear the difference between [ə] and [e], [u] and [ɔ], and oral and nasal vowels. Second, articulatory practice should train the mouth position, tongue height, lip rounding, and nasal airflow needed for French sounds. Third, reading aloud exercises should emphasize French grapheme to phoneme rules, especially silent final consonants and nasal vowel spelling patterns. Such training can reduce both interlingual interference from Indonesian and intralingual overgeneralization within French (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Roach, 2009).

Therefore, the pronunciation errors identified in this study show a systematic relationship between Indonesian phonology, French orthography, and the speaker's developing control of French sounds. The errors are not only technical details of pronunciation. They reveal how foreign language production depends on perception, articulation, lexical knowledge, and awareness of the target language sound system. In the context of diplomacy, this finding emphasizes the need for language preparation that goes beyond memorizing vocabulary or sentence patterns. Accurate pronunciation must become part of diplomatic language training so that public messages remain clear, respectful, and professional.

A closer reading of Table 1 also shows that the errors can be divided according to their phonological processes. The words *accord* and *dans* represent addition or epenthesis at the final position. The word *française* represents deletion because the expected [z] is not produced. The words *entre* and *le* represent vowel substitution, while *gouvernement* shows an inaccurate grapheme to phoneme conversion. *Indonésie* and *domaine* involve nasal vowel problems,

although the direction of the error is different. In Indonésie, nasalization is lost, whereas in domaine, nasalization is added. This variation confirms that pronunciation errors do not come from one source only. They result from the interaction of spelling, perception, articulatory habit, and incomplete knowledge of French phonology (Ellis, 1994; Odlin, 1989).

The addition of final consonants is the most visible pattern because it directly reflects the influence of writing. In French, many final consonants are silent, but Indonesian speakers may treat written consonants as obligatory sounds. The pronunciation of *accord* as [akɔrd] and *dans* as [dɑ̃s] shows this tendency. These errors indicate that the speaker processes French words through an Indonesian reading habit. In Indonesian, final consonants such as d, s, n, and r usually remain audible. Because of this habit, a written consonant at the end of a French word may be interpreted as a sound that must be pronounced. This finding supports Lado's (1957) contrastive hypothesis that elements which differ between two languages tend to create learning difficulty.

However, the omission of [z] in *française* shows the opposite problem. In this case, the speaker does not pronounce a final consonant that should be heard. This means that the speaker may already know the general idea that French often has silent final letters, but applies that idea too broadly. The error is not a simple transfer from Indonesian. It is also an overgeneralization of a French rule. This situation is common in foreign language learning. Learners may acquire one rule, such as final consonants are often silent, but later apply it to forms where the rule does not work. Brown (2007) describes this as a developmental error because it grows from partial understanding of the target language system.

Vowel related errors also deserve special attention because vowels carry an important role in French intelligibility. French has several vowel contrasts that are not identical to Indonesian vowel contrasts. The distinction between [ə] and [e], for instance, affects the contrast between *le* and *les*. The replacement of [ə] with [e] may sound minor for Indonesian listeners, but it changes the grammatical signal in French. The same issue appears in *entre*, where [ə] is realized as [e]. These findings show that learners need to treat vowel quality as a meaningful linguistic feature, not only as an accent feature. In French, a small change in vowel quality may mark the difference between singular and plural, between one lexical item and another, or between formal and nonstandard pronunciation (Léon, 1992; Walter, 1988).

The pronunciation of *gouvernement* adds another layer to the analysis. The error is not caused by the absence of [u] in Indonesian because Indonesian has a comparable high back rounded vowel. The problem instead lies in reading the French grapheme *ou*. This means that some errors are not caused by articulatory inability, but by insufficient knowledge of spelling sound correspondence. A speaker may be physically able to pronounce [u], yet still produce [ɔ] because the written form is misread. This distinction matters because the solution is different. Articulatory training is useful for sounds that are difficult to produce, while orthographic training is needed for words whose spelling does not transparently indicate pronunciation.

Nasal vowels form the most complex category in the data. In Indonésie, the written sequence *in* should produce [ɛ̃], but the speaker pronounces [in]. This indicates denasalization, where a nasal vowel is replaced by an oral vowel followed by a nasal consonant. In *domaine*, the speaker produces [dɔmɑ̃] instead of [dɔmɛn], which indicates inappropriate nasalization. These two errors point to unstable control of the nasal vowel system. The speaker recognizes

that French has nasal sounds, but has not fully mastered when nasalization should or should not appear. Such instability is expected when the target language has phonological categories that are absent or marginal in the first language (Flege, 1995; Best & Tyler, 2007).

From an articulatory point of view, nasal vowels require coordination between oral articulation and velum lowering. Indonesian speakers are familiar with nasal consonants, but not with nasal vowels as independent vowel qualities. This difference explains why a French nasal vowel may be replaced with a sequence that feels more natural to Indonesian speakers. For example, [ɛ̃] may be interpreted as [in] because the nasal quality is attached to a consonant rather than to the vowel itself. This pattern has also been found in classroom studies of French pronunciation among Indonesian learners, especially in the production of [ɛ̃], [ɑ̃], and [ɔ̃] (Rageh, 2019).

The role of the French rhotic [ʁ] should also be considered, although it is not the main source of error in Table 1. In several transcriptions, the expected pronunciation includes [ʁ], such as in *accord*, *entre*, *gouvernement*, and *française*. The French [ʁ] is commonly realized as a uvular sound, while Indonesian *r* is generally an alveolar trill or tap. Even when the speaker approximates the French form, the articulatory target remains challenging. In formal speech, the inaccurate production of [ʁ] may not always change lexical meaning, but it contributes to a foreign accent. This accent may still be understandable, yet it can influence listeners' judgment of fluency and preparedness (Munro & Derwing, 1995; Derwing & Munro, 2005).

The findings also suggest that pronunciation accuracy should be analyzed through intelligibility, comprehensibility, and accentedness. Intelligibility concerns whether the listener can correctly identify the word. Comprehensibility concerns how much effort the listener needs to understand the utterance. Accentedness concerns how different the pronunciation sounds from the expected variety. The errors in *dans* and *le* may affect intelligibility because they can be heard as different words. The errors in *gouvernement* and *Indonésie* may still be comprehensible in context, but they increase processing effort. This distinction helps avoid an overly harsh judgment. Not every pronunciation error has the same communicative weight (Munro & Derwing, 1995).

In the context of public diplomacy, however, even errors that remain intelligible can still carry symbolic consequences. A foreign minister does not speak only as an individual language learner. The speaker represents institutional authority, state identity, and diplomatic courtesy. When French is used in an international setting, the pronunciation of French words signals respect for the language and the interlocutor. This does not mean that a speaker must sound like a native speaker. Rather, the speaker should aim for clear, consistent, and sufficiently accurate pronunciation so that the message is not distracted by avoidable phonological errors. This position is consistent with contemporary pronunciation teaching, which prioritizes intelligibility and communicative effectiveness over native like perfection (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Derwing & Munro, 2005).

The analysis also shows that the speaker's errors are segmental rather than suprasegmental. The study focuses on individual sounds such as consonants, vowels, and nasal vowels. However, French pronunciation also involves rhythm, stress, liaison, enchaînement, and intonation. These suprasegmental features can strongly influence the naturalness of French speech. Because the present data come from a short public video, this study limits the analysis to segmental features that can be identified from the available utterances. Future research may

expand the object by using longer recordings and analyzing stress grouping, rhythm, and intonation patterns. Such expansion would provide a fuller picture of French pronunciation in Indonesian diplomatic speech.

Methodologically, the use of IPA transcription provides a systematic way to compare the observed pronunciation with the expected pronunciation. IPA helps the researcher avoid vague descriptions such as wrong vowel or unclear consonant. Each error can be described through a specific phonetic symbol and related to a specific articulatory feature. For instance, [u] and [ɔ] differ in tongue height, while [ẽ] and [in] differ in nasalization and segmental structure. This level of detail strengthens the analysis because the discussion is grounded in observable sound features rather than subjective impressions (Ladefoged, 2005; Ladefoged & Johnson, 2015).

Even so, the data source creates several limitations. The video is taken from YouTube Shorts, so the sound quality may be affected by compression, background noise, microphone quality, and editing. These factors may influence the clarity of certain sounds. For that reason, the analysis should be read as a phonological description based on the available recording, not as a full evaluation of the speaker's overall French ability. The study only examines selected French words found in the video. It does not assess grammar, vocabulary range, discourse organization, or pragmatic competence. This limitation is important because pronunciation is only one component of foreign language competence.

The study nevertheless has empirical value because it documents actual language use in a public setting. Many studies on French pronunciation focus on classroom learners, controlled word lists, or student recordings. This study uses spontaneous or semi prepared public speech, which gives a different perspective. The speaker is not a student in a classroom test, but a state official speaking in a diplomatic context. This setting makes the findings relevant for applied linguistics, language training, and diplomatic communication. It shows that pronunciation problems can appear even when the speaker has access to prepared language and formal speaking conditions.

The comparison with previous studies further confirms that Indonesian speakers face recurring difficulties in French pronunciation. Nugroho et al. (2022) found sound addition, deletion, and substitution in the pronunciation of French product names. Rageh (2019) found frequent errors in French vowels, nasal vowels, and semi vowels among high school learners. The present study shows similar error types in a different speaker profile and communicative setting. This continuity suggests that the difficulty is not merely individual. It reflects broader structural differences between Indonesian and French phonological systems.

The most practical implication is the need for focused pronunciation preparation before public speeches that include French terms. Such preparation should not only check the written script. It should include a phonetic rehearsal with correct audio models, IPA based notes for difficult words, and repeated listening practice. Words containing silent final consonants, nasal vowels, and the grapheme *ou* should receive special attention. The rehearsal can also include minimal pairs such as *le* and *les*, *dans* and *danse*, and oral vowel versus nasal vowel contrasts. This type of preparation is realistic and efficient because diplomatic speeches often contain a limited number of foreign language expressions.

The findings also support the use of corrective feedback from trained French speakers or phonetics specialists. A speaker may not notice an error because the incorrect form still

sounds acceptable within the speaker's own phonological system. External feedback helps identify differences that the speaker cannot easily perceive. In second language acquisition, perception often precedes accurate production. When speakers learn to hear a contrast, they become more capable of producing it. This principle is especially relevant for nasal vowels and schwa, which may not be salient for Indonesian speakers (Flege, 1995; Best & Tyler, 2007).

In addition to individual training, institutions that prepare officials for international communication can develop pronunciation checklists. The checklist may include silent final consonants, nasal vowel spellings, schwa realization, liaison environments, and high frequency diplomatic terms. For French, terms such as *accord*, *gouvernement*, *coopération*, *République*, *française*, *Indonésie*, *dans*, *domaine*, and *entre* should be checked carefully. A checklist does not replace language learning, but it can reduce preventable errors in formal speeches. It also creates a standard quality control process for multilingual public communication.

Theoretically, the study reinforces the view that foreign language pronunciation results from the interaction between perception and production. The speaker must perceive the target sound accurately, map it onto a phonological category, and then produce it through the appropriate articulatory gesture. Failure may occur at any of these stages. For example, [ɛ̃] may be misperceived as [in], [ə] may be mapped onto [e], and final silent consonants may be produced because the written form activates an Indonesian reading rule. This layered process explains why pronunciation training should combine listening, articulation, and orthographic awareness.

The data also demonstrate that phonological interference should not be treated as a sign of linguistic failure. It is a normal consequence of multilingual speech production. Speakers naturally use existing language knowledge when they encounter a new sound system. The academic task is to describe the pattern, identify its causes, and propose targeted improvement. In this study, the errors show that Indonesian and French differ in the treatment of final consonants, nasal vowels, vowel reduction, and spelling sound correspondence. Once these specific areas are identified, training can become more precise and less time consuming.

Finally, the results indicate that the communicative risk of pronunciation errors depends on context. In a casual conversation, listeners may ignore small errors or infer the intended meaning. In a formal diplomatic setting, the tolerance may be lower because the speech is public, recorded, and symbolically loaded. A short utterance may circulate widely on social media, and pronunciation may become part of public evaluation. For that reason, phonological accuracy should be viewed as part of speech preparation. It supports clarity, protects meaning, and strengthens the professional image of the speaker.

CONCLUSION

Based on the phonological analysis of the pronunciation of French by Foreign Minister Sugiono, it can be concluded that there are eight significant pronunciation errors. Most of these errors arise due to the influence of the sound system/interference of the Indonesian language, as well as the tendency to pronounce words based on their spelling. The error is not only phonemically distorted, but also has the potential to give rise to a change in meaning that can have serious consequences on a global stage such as the context in the YouTube video.

Common mistakes include adding final consonants that should not be spoken, such as *accord* [akɔr] becoming [akɔrd] or *dans* [dɑ̃] which sounds like [dɑ̃s], so that it resembles a word *danse*. Furthermore, changes in vowel quality, such as *entre* pronounced [ɑ̃tre] approaching *entré* or *le* becoming [le] so that it resembles *les*, as well as the abandonment of the diphthong's rule in the pronounced *gouvernement* word [gɔvɛ̃nɑ̃mɑ̃] instead of [gɔvɛ̃nɑ̃mɑ̃]. In addition, there has also been the omission of final consonants that should be sounded vibrantly, such as *française* pronounced [fʁɑ̃sɛ] rather than [fʁɑ̃sɛz], as well as the use of inappropriate nasal or nasal sounds, such as in the pronounced *domaine* [dɔmɑ̃].

These findings show that mastery of vocabulary alone is not enough, but rather an understanding of the phonological system of the French language. Therefore, special training that emphasizes the ability to hear and produce sounds, especially sounds that are not found in Indonesian such as [ʁ], nasal vowels, and vowels [u], are highly recommended for public officials and diplomats who communicate in French. This effort is necessary so that phonological interference can be minimized and the message conveyed in the international context remains accurate and professional.

REFERENCES

- Best, C. T., & Tyler, M. D. (2007). Nonnative and second-language speech perception: Commonalities and complementarities. In O. S. Bohn & M. J. Munro (Eds.), *Language experience in second language speech learning: In honor of James Emil Flege* (pp. 13–34). John Benjamins.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., Goodwin, J. M., & Griner, B. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A course book and reference guide* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Chaer, A. (2014). *Linguistik umum*. Rineka Cipta.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2005). Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 379–397.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Flege, J. E. (1995). Second language speech learning: Theory, findings, and problems. In W. Strange (Ed.), *Speech perception and linguistic experience: Issues in cross-language research* (pp. 233–277). York Press.
- Gunawan, I. (2021). *Metode penelitian kualitatif*. Zbook. <https://zbook.org/read/12be66-metode-penelitian-kualitatif-imam-gunawan.html>
- Hernawati, H. (2017). The use of mother tongue as an introduction in language learning. *Semantik*, 83–91.
- Ladefoged, P. (2005). *A course in phonetics* (5th ed.). Thomson Wadsworth.
- Ladefoged, P., & Johnson, K. (2015). *A course in phonetics* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. University of Michigan Press.
- Léon, P. (1992). *Phonétisme et prononciations du français*. Nathan.
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning*, 45(1), 73–97.
- Murdiyanto. (2020). *Metode penelitian kualitatif: Teori dan aplikasi disertai contoh proposal*. Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat.

- Nilamsari, N. (2014). Memahami studi dokumen dalam penelitian kualitatif. *Wacana*, 13, 177–181.
- Nugroho, U. H., Sari, W., & Santoso, W. J. (2022). Analysis of the sound pronunciation of French products in French literature students of Semarang State University. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 103–113.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rageh, A. A. (2019). *Mispronunciation of French vowel and semi-vowel sounds in class XI of SMA N 9 Bandar Lampung* [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Lampung].
- Roach, P. (2009). *English phonetics and phonology: A practical course* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Setyaningsih, Y., & Rahardi, K. (2014). *Fonologi bahasa Indonesia*. Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Valdman, A. (1993). *Bien entendu! Introduction à la prononciation française*. Prentice Hall.
- Walter, H. (1988). *Le français dans tous les sens*. Robert Laffont.