

First Language, Target Language and Learning Strategies in Learners' Interlanguage: An Integrative Review

Nopita Agnesia¹, Mardriana², Ni Luh Sunitha³
Leoni Puspita Sari⁴, Iwan Fauzi^{5*}

^{1,2,3,4,5} English Education Study Program, University of Palangka Raya, Palangka Raya, Indonesia

Informasi Artikel:

Dikirim: 20-Agustus-2026
Direvisi: 16-September-2026
Diterima: 25-September-2026

Dipublikasikan online:
30-September-2026

*Korespondensi Penulis:
i_fauzi@edu.upr.ac.id

Article DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.69743/edumedia.v4i2.71>

Abstract: Interlanguage is the developing linguistic system that learners construct while moving between a first language and a target language. This integrative review examines how first-language influence, target-language development, and learning strategies jointly shape that system. Ten peer-reviewed studies published from 2017 to 2024 were purposively selected from publisher archives, indexed discovery services, and scholarly search records. The studies address Indonesian EFL writing, Indonesian as a foreign language, interlanguage pragmatics, learner language analysis, communication strategies, pragmatic learning strategies, learner autonomy, and fossilization. A thematic synthesis identified four connected patterns. First, learner production is permeable to both languages: L1 influence appears especially in lexical choice, word order, and pragmatics, whereas incomplete target-language knowledge is visible in overgeneralization and other developmental patterns. Second, error forms cannot be assigned to L1 transfer alone because learners actively test and reorganize target-language hypotheses. Third, pragmatic performance depends on the relationship between linguistic forms, social distance, power, and culturally situated norms. Fourth, strategy use and autonomy can support noticing, practice, monitoring, and revision, although strategy use varies with proficiency and learning experience. The review argues that Indonesian language education should diagnose errors as evidence of development, combine contrastive and form-focused support with meaningful interaction, and make pragmatic strategy instruction explicit. Because the included studies differ in language pairs, methods, and contexts, the synthesis does not estimate a common effect size. Instead, it offers a transparent, context-sensitive account of how linguistic and strategic factors interact in interlanguage development.

Keywords: interlanguage, first language, target language, language learning strategies, learner autonomy

This article is licensed under
Creative Commons Attribution
Non-Commercial 4.0 International
License.



Abstract: *Interbahasa merupakan sistem linguistik berkembang yang dibangun pembelajar ketika bergerak antara bahasa pertama dan bahasa target. Tinjauan integratif ini mengkaji bagaimana pengaruh bahasa pertama, perkembangan bahasa target, dan strategi belajar secara bersama-sama membentuk sistem tersebut. Sepuluh penelitian sejawat yang terbit pada 2017-2024 dipilih secara purposif melalui arsip penerbit, layanan penelusuran terindeks, dan catatan pencarian ilmiah. Kajian yang dianalisis membahas tulisan EFL di Indonesia, bahasa Indonesia sebagai bahasa asing, pragmatik interbahasa, analisis bahasa pembelajar, strategi komunikasi, strategi belajar pragmatik, otonomi pembelajar, dan fosilisasi. Sintesis tematik menemukan empat pola yang saling terhubung. Pertama, produksi pembelajar bersifat permeabel terhadap kedua bahasa: pengaruh B1 tampak terutama pada pemilihan leksikal, urutan kata, dan pragmatik, sedangkan pengetahuan bahasa target yang belum lengkap tampak pada generalisasi berlebihan serta pola perkembangan lainnya. Kedua, bentuk kesalahan tidak dapat seluruhnya dikaitkan dengan transfer B1 karena pembelajar secara aktif menguji dan menata ulang hipotesis tentang bahasa target. Ketiga, kinerja pragmatik bergantung pada hubungan antara bentuk bahasa, jarak sosial, kekuasaan, dan norma yang terikat budaya. Keempat, penggunaan strategi dan otonomi dapat mendukung kegiatan menyadari, berlatih, memantau, dan merevisi, meskipun penggunaannya berbeda menurut kemahiran dan pengalaman belajar. Kajian ini merekomendasikan agar pengajaran bahasa di Indonesia memperlakukan kesalahan sebagai bukti perkembangan, memadukan dukungan kontrastif dan fokus bentuk dengan interaksi bermakna, serta mengajarkan strategi pragmatik secara eksplisit. Karena studi yang ditinjau berbeda dalam pasangan bahasa, metode, dan konteks, sintesis ini tidak menghitung satu ukuran efek bersama; artikel ini menawarkan penjelasan yang transparan dan peka konteks mengenai interaksi faktor linguistik dan strategis dalam perkembangan interbahasa.*

Kata kunci: *interbahasa, bahasa pertama, bahasa target, strategi belajar bahasa, otonomi pembelajar*

CARA MENGUTIP:

Agnesia, N., Mardriana., Sunitha, N.L., Sari, L.P., Fauzi, I. (2025). First Language, Target Language and Learning Strategies in Learners' Interlanguage: An Integrative Review. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar & Menengah – Edumedia*, 4(2), 205–216. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69743/edumedia.v4i2.71>

1. INTRODUCTION

Second language acquisition does not normally proceed as a direct replacement of one linguistic system by another. Learners construct a provisional system that allows them to communicate while their knowledge of the target language remains incomplete. Selinker (1972) termed this system interlanguage. The term is useful because it directs attention away from a deficit view of learner production. A non-target-like form may be inaccurate in relation to a target-language norm, yet it can still be systematic, meaningful, and informative about the learner's current hypotheses. Corder (1967) similarly argued that learner errors are evidence of an active learning process. For teachers and researchers, the analytical question is therefore not only whether a form is correct, but also what cognitive, linguistic, strategic, and social conditions may have produced it.

Interlanguage is especially important in multilingual and foreign-language classrooms, where learners move continually between established first-language resources and partial knowledge of a new language. In Indonesian EFL writing, for example, Fauziati (2017) examined 264 ill-formed sentences and found influence from both Indonesian and English at lexical and syntactic levels. Indonesian borrowings were a prominent L1-related pattern, while target-language grammar, particularly verb tense, generated a larger share of the observed influences. This finding complicates any explanation that treats errors as simple interference. The first language offers resources that learners can draw on, but limited or uneven knowledge of the target language also shapes what they produce (Fauzi, 2014b).

The same point is visible when Indonesian is the target language. Mahriyuni et al. (2024) investigated writing produced by French learners of Indonesian and identified recurring difficulties in spelling, vocabulary selection, word or phrase order, pronouns, prepositions, and adverbs. The value of comparing these studies lies not in claiming that French learners of Indonesian and Indonesian learners of English make identical errors. Rather, both studies illustrate a broader property of interlanguage: learners rely on previously available linguistic knowledge while also attempting to infer the organization of the language they are learning. Interlanguage is therefore permeable to cross-linguistic influence and internally developing target-language rules.

A complete account must also extend beyond morphosyntax. Learners need to choose forms that fit relationships, purposes, and cultural expectations in interaction. This domain is commonly described as interlanguage pragmatics. Studies of requests and apologies show that learners may transfer expectations about directness, politeness, responsibility, and appropriate redress from one language or cultural setting into another (Al-Rawafi et al., 2021; Oktavia et al., 2023). A sentence can consequently be grammatically well formed while remaining pragmatically unexpected in a particular context. Such cases matter for language education because communicative success depends on both linguistic accuracy and contextually appropriate action.

Learning strategies are a further part of the explanation. Strategy use includes intentional efforts to notice language, collect examples, compare forms, seek clarification, rehearse, monitor performance, and evaluate results. In a study of 160 EFL learners, Derakhshan et al. (2024) found that use of interlanguage pragmatic learning strategies was associated with age,

language-learning experience, and L2 proficiency; learners with longer learning experience and higher proficiency reported more strategy use. Alsmari (2024) also reported an association between learner autonomy and pragmatic learning strategy use in a Saudi EFL context. These studies do not establish that strategies alone cause interlanguage development, but they demonstrate why learners' regulation of attention and practice belongs in the analysis.

Prior discussions frequently treat L1 transfer, target-language developmental errors, and learning strategies as separate topics. That separation is useful for defining concepts, but it can obscure their interaction in actual learner production. This article therefore asks: (1) How do first-language and target-language factors jointly shape learner interlanguage? (2) How do pragmatic competence, learning strategies, and learner autonomy contribute to the development or revision of interlanguage? and (3) What instructional implications can be drawn for language education, especially in Indonesian EFL and multilingual settings? The article synthesizes ten selected studies while using foundational SLA scholarship to frame, rather than substitute for, the reviewed evidence.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Interlanguage as a Developing System

Selinker's (1972) formulation of interlanguage established learner language as a system in its own right. The system is not merely a blend of L1 and L2, nor is it a random collection of performance slips. It changes as learners receive input, attempt communication, receive feedback, and revise their hypotheses. Corder's (1967) account of the significance of errors supports this developmental interpretation: errors can reveal the learner's current internal grammar and the direction of change. This perspective is particularly relevant for classroom assessment. If an error is treated only as a failure requiring immediate correction, teachers may miss evidence about which contrasts or contextual constraints are not yet understood.

A developmental account nevertheless does not imply that all errors have the same status. Some are likely momentary performance problems, some reflect L1-mediated choices, and some arise from productive attempts to generalize a target-language pattern. Others may become relatively stable if learners receive little opportunity to notice a mismatch or revise their output. Wang (2023) discusses fossilization as a possible stagnation in aspects of interlanguage and highlights the need for sustained, evidence-based pedagogical intervention. The present review therefore distinguishes between an error token and an explanatory claim: one observed form cannot by itself prove transfer, developmental processing, or fossilization. Context, frequency, learner history, and comparison with relevant language systems are needed before making a strong attribution.

2.2 First Language Influence and Target Language Development

First-language influence is often described as transfer. Transfer can be facilitative when the languages share a relevant pattern, or constraining when learners extend an L1 pattern to a target-language context in which it does not apply (Fauzi, 2021). The empirical work reviewed here supports a nuanced view. Fauziati (2017) found both native-language and target-language influences in Indonesian EFL compositions, while Mahriyuni et al. (2024) documented errors

produced by French learners of Indonesian across grammatical, syntactic, and lexical categories. These studies make it difficult to defend an either-or model in which an error is always interlingual or always intralingual. A learner may rely on an L1-based pattern while simultaneously overextending a partially acquired target-language rule.

Target-language influence is commonly visible in simplification, omission, analogical extension, and overgeneralization (Fauzi, 2014a). Such forms can indicate that learners have noticed a regularity but have not yet learned its scope or exceptions. Krashen (1982) emphasized the importance of comprehensible input, and Long (1996) argued that interaction can support acquisition by making communication problems noticeable and negotiable. These positions are not identical theories, yet both draw attention to learning conditions beyond the first language. Repeated access to meaningful input, chances to test a form, and feedback that focuses attention on a relevant contrast can all help learners revise a developing system.

The categories are also affected by the mode of production. Written tasks allow planning and revision, whereas spontaneous interaction places greater demands on real-time processing. Yakut and Bada (2021) explored oral and written communication strategies among Turkish speakers of English, illustrating the importance of examining interlanguage across modalities rather than treating a single written task as the entire learner system. Learner language may vary with task demands, interlocutor, topic familiarity, and time pressure. For this reason, teachers should avoid making broad claims about ability from a narrow sample of output.

2.3 Pragmatics Learning Strategies and Learner Autonomy

Interlanguage pragmatics concerns how learners acquire and use socially appropriate ways of performing actions such as requesting, refusing, apologizing, thanking, and disagreeing. The relevant learning target is not a fixed list of polite expressions. Learners need to relate linguistic choices to contextual variables, including role relationships, social distance, the seriousness of an imposition, and community expectations. Al-Rawafi et al. (2021) examined apology strategies in Arabic and English at an Indonesian Islamic boarding school. Oktavia et al. (2023) examined direct and indirect requests used by international students. Together, these studies demonstrate why grammatical instruction alone cannot guarantee successful intercultural interaction.

Strategies can make pragmatic learning more deliberate. Sykes and Cohen (2018) argue for explicit and comprehensive strategies for interlanguage pragmatics, including strategies for noticing, analysing, using, evaluating, and reflecting on speech acts. The reviewed empirical studies connect this perspective to learner characteristics. Derakhshan et al. (2024) found differences in reported pragmatic strategy use related to age, learning experience, and proficiency. Alsmari (2024) found a positive relationship between learner autonomy and pragmatic learning strategy use. Autonomy should not be reduced to studying alone. In this context, it means that learners can set goals, seek examples, monitor their choices, use feedback, and decide how to repair a pragmatic or linguistic problem. These processes can make the interlanguage system more responsive to evidence from use.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study used an integrative literature review design. An integrative review permits empirical and analytical studies using different methods to be brought into a conceptually coherent synthesis (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). The design was selected because the purpose was to examine relationships among L1 influence, target-language development, pragmatics, strategies, and autonomy, rather than to estimate one statistically comparable intervention effect. Accordingly, this manuscript is not presented as a PRISMA systematic review or a meta-analysis. The analysis is interpretive and thematic, with methodological transparency used to make the scope of the synthesis clear.

The source-selection process was targeted and structured. Searches and bibliographic verification were completed in September 2026 through Google Scholar records, GARUDA and other indexed discovery services, publisher archives, and journal webpages. The search combined the terms “interlanguage,” “first language influence,” “target language,” “language transfer,” “interlanguage pragmatics,” “pragmatic learning strategies,” “learner autonomy,” “communication strategies,” “EFL,” and “Indonesian.” Reference lists and citation information were also checked to verify authorship, publication year, journal, page range, and DOI where available. Foundational works by Corder, Selinker, Krashen, and Long were used only to frame the discussion and were not counted among the ten reviewed studies.

To be included in the reviewed corpus, a source had to be a peer-reviewed journal article published from 2017 through 2024; be available in English; address learner interlanguage, transfer, target-language development, communication strategies, interlanguage pragmatics, learner autonomy, or fossilization; and report an empirical analysis or a clearly identified analytical contribution with implications for learner development. Sources were excluded when they were unpublished manuscripts, purely instructional webpages, duplicates, unrelated to SLA, or too limited in bibliographic information to verify. The final corpus contains ten studies. Table 1 states the selection criteria so readers can distinguish the selected evidence from the wider conceptual literature.

Table 1. Eligibility criteria for the selected review corpus

Criterion	Included	Excluded
Publication period	2017-2024	Before 2017 for the reviewed corpus; foundational works retained only as background
Publication type	Peer-reviewed journal article	Unpublished paper, non-scholarly webpage, duplicate
Topical focus	Interlanguage, transfer, target-language development, pragmatics, strategies, autonomy, or fossilization in SLA	Topic unrelated to learner language development
Language	English full text or reliable English bibliographic record	Insufficiently verifiable publication record
Use in synthesis	Empirical finding or analytical contribution relevant to at least one review question	No identifiable relevance to the review questions

For each study, the review recorded the language-learning context, aim, design or data source, principal finding, and interpretive relevance. The studies were then compared through iterative coding. Initial codes captured L1-related influence, target-language developmental patterns, pragmatic transfer, interactional context, strategy use, autonomy, and instructional implications. Codes were grouped into four themes: (a) permeability to L1 and target-language knowledge, (b) developmental processing and task conditions, (c) pragmatics as contextual competence, and (d) strategic and autonomous regulation of learning. The themes were refined by checking whether each proposed pattern was supported by more than one source or required explicit qualification because of contextual limits.

No numerical pooling was attempted. The selected studies differ substantially in language pairs, participant ages, proficiency, research aims, instruments, and outcome measures. A frequency observed in an error-analysis study, a reported association in a survey, and a discourse pattern in a pragmatic task do not represent equivalent effect estimates. The synthesis therefore reports convergence and divergence in claims, not a ranking of causes. This approach also guards against a common overinterpretation: the co-occurrence of an error and an L1-L2 difference does not by itself demonstrate causal transfer. The review treats transfer as a plausible explanation only when a study's design and analysis support that interpretation.

4. RESULTS

The ten selected studies cover several language pairs and complementary aspects of learner language. Table 2 summarizes the evidence base used for the thematic synthesis. The table intentionally reports the scope of each study rather than reducing its result to a universal rule. This is important because interlanguage patterns depend on the learners, the target language, the task, and the interactional setting.

Table 2. Summary of studies included in the integrative review

Study	Context and focus	Contribution to the synthesis
Fauziati (2017)	Indonesian EFL free compositions; 264 ill-formed sentences analysed for native- and target-language influence.	Shows permeability to both linguistic system. L1 influence was prominent in vocabulary and target-language influence in grammar.
González and Alvarado Martínez (2020)	Written English produced by 14 university EFL learners; qualitative error analysis.	Supports the view that syntactic errors can reflect several internal factors and cannot always be assigned one source.
He (2019)	Case study of a Chinese EFL learner using learner-language analysis.	Illustrates the analytical value of describing learner language as evidence about SLA processes.
Al-Rawafi et al. (2021)	Arabic-English apology strategies at an Indonesian Islamic boarding school.	Demonstrates pragmatic transfer and the need to examine social meaning as well as grammatical form.
Yakut and Bada (2021)	Turkish speakers of English; oral and written communication strategies.	Highlights strategy use and the need to study interlanguage across modalities.

Study	Context and focus	Contribution to the synthesis
Oktavia et al. (2023)	International students' direct and indirect request strategies.	Shows that cultural and contextual variables shape request realization and politeness choices.
Wang (2023)	Analytical article on interlanguage fossilization and teaching implications.	Provides a cautious basis for discussing persistent patterns and the importance of intervention.
Derakhshan et al. (2024)	160 EFL learners; survey of interlanguage pragmatic learning strategies.	Reports that learning experience and proficiency were related to more reported pragmatic strategy use; gender difference was not significant.
Alsmari (2024)	Saudi EFL learners; autonomy and interlanguage pragmatic learning strategies.	Connects learner autonomy with pragmatic strategy use and supports explicit strategy training.
Mahriyuni et al. (2024)	French learners writing Indonesian as a foreign language.	Documents grammatical, syntactic, lexical, and orthographic difficulties shaped by a distinct L1-L2 pairing.

The first theme is permeability to both L1 and target-language knowledge. Fauziati (2017) is the clearest Indonesian EFL example: learner compositions contained influence from Indonesian and English, with different distributions across lexical and grammatical categories. Mahriyuni et al. (2024) provides a reverse-language-pair example. French learners of Indonesian displayed difficulties in word or phrase order, vocabulary selection, spelling, prepositions, pronouns, and adverbs. These studies do not claim that all forms originate in the learners' first language. Instead, they show that the developing system is open to cross-linguistic influence and to the consequences of incomplete target-language knowledge.

The second theme is developmental processing. Learners simplify complex forms, extend a perceived rule to an inappropriate context, and select a form that is available under processing pressure. González and Alvarado Martínez (2020) found that the written production of fourteen university EFL learners involved multiple possible influences; this supports caution in assigning one error to a single cause. He (2019) likewise illustrates the value of learner-language analysis for examining development in a case-specific way. The convergent implication is that error analysis should be explanatory rather than merely enumerative. Teachers need samples, contrasts, and task information before deciding whether a pattern warrants contrastive support, form-focused instruction, more input, feedback, or strategic practice.

The third theme is pragmatic development. Al-Rawafi et al. (2021) shows that apology behavior can reflect interlanguage pragmatics in an Indonesian Islamic boarding-school setting. Oktavia et al. (2023) similarly shows variation in direct and indirect request strategies among international students. In both cases, pragmatic choice cannot be reduced to vocabulary or grammar. Learners must interpret what a situation demands and match a linguistic form to relationships and expectations. The evidence therefore supports an expanded account of

interlanguage that includes pragmalinguistic resources, such as the wording of an apology or request, and sociopragmatic judgement about when and with whom a form is appropriate.

The fourth theme concerns strategies and learner agency. Derakhshan et al. (2024) found that learners with longer language-learning experience and higher L2 proficiency reported greater use of interlanguage pragmatic learning strategies. The study also reported higher strategy use among younger than adult learners in its sample, while finding no statistically significant gender difference. Alsmari (2024) found that autonomy was positively related to pragmatic learning strategy use. These findings do not imply a single causal route from autonomy to proficiency. They do, however, support the educational importance of helping learners notice pragmatic choices, seek input, compare alternatives, reflect on feedback, and monitor their own communicative goals.

Across the corpus, several qualifications recur. First, the evidence is context-bound. A writing study cannot by itself describe oral interaction, and a speech-act task cannot fully represent sustained classroom learning. Second, terms such as transfer, error, strategy, and autonomy are operationalized differently across studies. Third, the studies do not uniformly report longitudinal change, so they cannot determine whether a particular learner pattern will disappear, stabilise, or fossilize. The results are therefore best read as a set of connected tendencies. They justify an interactional model of interlanguage, but they do not justify a universal sequence or a one-factor explanation.

5. DISCUSSION

The review indicates that first-language influence, target-language development, and learning strategies should be analysed as interacting dimensions of one developing system. A learner may select an L1-like word order because it is readily accessible, overgeneralize a target-language rule because it appears productive, and use a communication strategy to complete a message despite an unresolved form. These processes may occur within a single utterance. A pedagogical diagnosis that labels the entire utterance “interference” misses the learner’s active construction of target-language knowledge. Conversely, a diagnosis that calls every pattern “developmental” ignores the resources and expectations that learners bring from their first language and culture.

This interactional interpretation refines the role of contrastive analysis. Contrastive comparison remains useful when it is used diagnostically. For Indonesian EFL learners, a teacher can compare Indonesian and English patterns that are likely to create difficulty, for example tense marking, articles, word order, or lexical borrowing. For learners of Indonesian, a comparable comparison can address contrasts in pronouns, prepositions, spelling conventions, and phrase order. The purpose is not to predict every error in advance or to portray the L1 as an obstacle. Instead, comparison can help learners notice where a familiar pattern is helpful, where it is misleading, and what evidence in the target language should guide a revision.

The review also supports a distinction between corrective work on form and communicative work on meaning. These are complementary, not competing, goals. Focused feedback can help a learner recognise a recurring form-meaning mismatch. Meaningful interaction gives the learner a reason to test a revised form and to notice whether it works with

an interlocutor. Long's (1996) interaction perspective is relevant here because clarification, repetition, confirmation checks, and feedback can make a gap in understanding visible. However, feedback should be selective and linked to a purpose. Correcting every deviation in a single task can overload learners and conceal the developmental pattern that matters most.

Pragmatic competence requires the same balance. Students need opportunities to examine authentic or carefully designed examples of requests, apologies, refusals, disagreement, and other speech acts. They should compare at least two possible forms, identify the contextual variables that change the choice, rehearse a response, and reflect on the effect of the wording. Sykes and Cohen (2018) describe strategy instruction as a means of making the learning of pragmatics explicit and comprehensive. In the Indonesian context, this can include comparing expressions across Bahasa Indonesia, local languages where relevant, English, and other languages in the classroom without treating one cultural practice as the only legitimate norm. The instructional aim is flexible, respectful communicative judgement.

Learner autonomy is most productive when it is scaffolded. Asking learners to “be autonomous” without tools, models, or feedback can reproduce existing inequalities in confidence and access. The studies reviewed here suggest more concrete practices: learning logs that record a language choice and its revision; strategy checklists for noticing and evaluating speech acts; peer discussion that explains why one response may fit a scenario better than another; and short self-assessments tied to an attainable communicative goal. These activities develop metapragmatic awareness and self-regulation while still locating the teacher as a designer of accessible learning conditions. They are consistent with the association between autonomy and pragmatic strategy use reported by Alsmari (2024).

The findings have several implications for assessment. First, teachers should collect more than one kind of performance, such as a draft-and-revision writing task, a role play, and a brief reflective explanation of the learner's choices. Second, assessment criteria should distinguish grammatical accuracy, comprehensibility, pragmatic appropriateness, strategic repair, and improvement over time. A learner who successfully repairs a misunderstanding may demonstrate an important communicative resource even if the original wording was non-target-like. Third, feedback records can be used to identify patterns across time. This is especially important before invoking fossilization, which requires evidence of persistence rather than the presence of a frequent error in one exercise.

The review has limitations that should shape how its claims are used. The corpus is small and purposively selected, not exhaustive. The studies represent different L1-L2 combinations, participant groups, settings, and instruments. Several studies are cross-sectional, making developmental inferences provisional. The review also relies on published study reports and therefore cannot address unpublished null findings. Future research would benefit from longitudinal designs that combine error analysis with learner interviews, classroom observation, interaction data, and repeated measures of pragmatic performance. Indonesian settings are particularly well positioned for such research because multilingual repertoires can reveal both the resources and challenges that learners bring to an additional language.

Despite these limitations, the synthesis offers a clearer basis for journal-level argument than a description of interlanguage as a collection of mistakes. It identifies a plausible

educational pathway: notice a recurring pattern; investigate whether the pattern is related to L1 resources, target-language development, task conditions, or a combination; provide explicit comparison or focused feedback; create a meaningful opportunity to use a revised form; and support the learner to monitor the result. This pathway connects language form, social meaning, strategy use, and learner agency. It also respects the central insight of interlanguage theory: learner language is developing knowledge in action.

6. CONCLUSION

This integrative review examined how first-language influence, target-language development, and learning strategies shape learners' interlanguage. The synthesis of ten studies supports three principal conclusions. First, interlanguage is permeable to both L1 resources and partially acquired target-language rules. Lexical, syntactic, orthographic, and pragmatic patterns may consequently reflect more than one source. Second, pragmatic competence is integral to interlanguage development because learners must relate linguistic forms to social relationships, purposes, and cultural expectations. Third, strategy use and learner autonomy can support the noticing, practice, monitoring, and revision through which learners make their developing systems more flexible and accurate.

For Indonesian journal readers and language educators, the practical message is not to abandon grammatical accuracy or to accept persistent errors uncritically. It is to interpret errors carefully. Teaching should combine diagnostic contrastive comparison, focused attention to form, rich target-language input, meaningful interaction, explicit pragmatic strategy instruction, and structured opportunities for self-regulation. Such a combination treats learners as active constructors of knowledge while giving them the linguistic and social resources needed to revise that knowledge.

The article should be read as a transparent integrative synthesis rather than a meta-analysis. Its contribution is to connect dimensions that are often discussed separately and to identify the limits of the current evidence. Future longitudinal and mixed-method research can test how these factors interact over time across Indonesian EFL, BIPA, and other multilingual learning contexts. Until then, interlanguage remains best understood as a dynamic record of learners' attempts to make meaning, negotiate social relations, and move toward greater control of a new language.

REFERENCES

- Al-Rawafi, A., Sudana, D., Lukmana, I., & Syihabuddin, S. (2021). Students' apologizing in Arabic and English: An interlanguage pragmatic case study at an Islamic boarding school in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 589-602. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31740>
- Alsmari, N. A. (2024). Learner autonomy and interlanguage pragmatic learning strategies (IPLS) use: A gender-based analysis in the Saudi EFL context. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 42, 145-162. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2024.42.09>

- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(1-4), 161-170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>
- Derakhshan, A., Malmir, A., Pawlak, M., & Wang, Y. (2024). The use of interlanguage pragmatic learning strategies (IPLS) by L2 learners: The impact of age, gender, language learning experience, and L2 proficiency levels. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 62(4), 1985-2008. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2022-0132>
- Fauzi, I. (2014a). Grammar Errors in Interlanguage Performed by English Learners of Indonesian College Students. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(2), 135-145. <https://tinyurl.com/67313427fauzi>
- Fauzi, I. (2014b). Does Fossilization Really Happen to English Language Learners?. *The Multifaceted Dimensions of English Linguistics, Literature and Education*, 247. <https://idr.uin-antasari.ac.id/6578/2/2.%20content.pdf#page=255>
- Fauzi, I. (2021). The Variability in Phonology of Indonesian Learner's Interlanguage: A Case Study on English Marked-Fricatives. *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(4), 285-295. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1330548>
- Fauziati, E. (2017). Native and target language influence on the students' interlanguage production: A case of Indonesian EFL compositions. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 54-63. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i1.6858>
- González, R. C. B., & Alvarado Martínez, E. (2020). The interlanguage in learners of English as a foreign language: An error analysis approach. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 44(1), 1-8. https://www.mextesol.net/journal/index.php?page=journal&id_article=17156
- He, L. (2019). Learner language analysis: A case study of a Chinese EFL student. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(3), 1013-1019. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/d5dfd586c15f0487fc065e9a25460431/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=4424407>
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Academic Press.
- Mahriyuni, Pramuniati, I., & Sitinjak, D. R. (2024). The interlanguage of French learning Indonesian as a foreign language. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 206-219. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v14i1.70394>
- Oktavia, D., Bányi, S., Mukminin, A., Santos, M. L., Astrero, E. P. T., Torress, J. M., & Marzulina, L. (2023). The manifestation of interlanguage pragmatics in direct and indirect request strategies used by international students. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 10(3), 1379-1401. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i3.27548>
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(1-4), 209-231. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>
- Sykes, J. M., & Cohen, A. D. (2018). Strategies and interlanguage pragmatics: Explicit and comprehensive. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 381-402. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssl1t.2018.8.2.9>

- Wang, P. (2023). Teaching implications of interlanguage fossilization. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, 3(3), 53-56. <https://doi.org/10.54097/jeer.v3i3.9550>
- Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 52(5), 546-553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x>
- Yakut, I., & Bada, E. (2021). Interlanguage development of Turkish speakers of English: Exploring oral and written communication strategies. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 9(4), 611-626. <https://espeap.junis.ni.ac.rs/index.php/espeap/article/view/1174>