JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching
https://e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/jollt
Email: jollt@undikma.ac.id
DOI: https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i2.13704

April 2025. Vol.13, No.2
p-ISSN: 2338-0810
e-ISSN: 2621-1378
pp. 616-631

PARENTAL STRATEGIES IN MANAGING L1 INTERFERENCE IN EARLY SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: AN INTRINSIC CASE STUDY

[1]*Alan Jaelani, [2]Zainal Rafli, [2]Fathiaty Murtadho
[1]English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ibn Khaldun Bogor, Indonesia
[2]Applied Linguistics, Postgraduate, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author Email: alan.jaelani@uika-bogor.ac.id

Article Info
Article History
Received: November 2024
Revised: February 2025
Published: April 2025

Keywords
Bilingualism;
Early language acquisition;
L1 interference;
Parental strategies;

Abstract

Drawing upon naturalistic data since the intake of English at the age of two, this longitudinal intrinsic case study examines the developmental trajectories of bilingual subject realization in an Early Second Language Acquisition (ESLA). Early bilingual exposure is widely recognized for its cognitive and linguistic benefits, yet challenges such as first language (L1) interference remain underexplored. This study focuses on a single child's unique language learning journey which offers an in-depth exploration of how specific parental strategies, including exclusive use of English at home, curated media exposure, and interactive language use, contribute to the child reaching a CEFR B2 level by age seven. Despite the supportive language environment, this study identifies consistent patterns of L1 interference in areas such as syntax, word order, and morphology. Using qualitative analyses of spontaneous speech data, this study identifies recurring error patterns and their implications for bilingual language development. The findings emphasize the dual role of parental influence in fostering second language (L2) proficiency while also revealing structural challenges that necessitate personalized corrective strategies. This research offers practical insights for parents and educators in emphasizing the need for targeted interventions to mitigate L1 interference and optimize bilingual acquisition outcomes.

How to cite: Jaelani, A., Rafli, Z., & Murtadho, F. (2025). Parental Strategies in Managing L1 Interference in Early Second Language Acquisition: An Intrinsic Case Study, *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(2), 616-631. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i2.13704

INTRODUCTION

The acquisition of a second language (L2) during early childhood offers treasured insights into cognitive development and linguistic growth in bilingual contexts. Early Second Language Acquisition (ESLA) refers to scenarios where children, after acquiring their first language (L1) from birth, begin learning an L2 after the age of two or three (Jansen, 2024). This period, often within the critical developmental years, presents unique opportunities for cognitive and linguistic growth, shaping how children manage the complex task of learning multiple languages simultaneously. Research has shown that bilingualism fosters enhanced executive functioning, increased cultural adaptability, and advanced proficiency in both languages, with numerous studies emphasizing the importance of input (Estremera, 2023; Fei, 2023; Krashen, 1985; Li, 2023; Luo, 2024), interaction (Boyarkina, 2020; Nikolaus & Fourtassi, 2023), and the critical period hypothesis (Azieb & Ben, 2021; Singleton & Leśniewska, 2021; Zokhida et al., 2020). However, in non-native English-speaking countries like Indonesia, where English is often introduced in formal educational settings rather than through naturalistic exposure, achieving advanced proficiency in English at an early age remains rare. Cases of children attaining such proficiency before formal schooling suggest that environmental and parental factors can play a transformative role in language development.

These factors include the provision of comprehensible input, high-quality interaction, and immersion, all of which are crucial for achieving high levels of L2 proficiency.

Existing research on bilingualism largely focuses on contexts where both L1 and L2 are actively used in the community or in structured classroom settings (Kabha & Berger, 2020; Lucas, 2022; Supramaniam & Shahirah, 2022). Studies exploring the relationship between input quantity and bilingual development, particularly in community-supported bilingual environments, offer valuable insights but fail to fully address situations where L2 is neither the dominant language in the community nor supported by institutional frameworks. For instance, research Faraj & Hamid (2023), Sorenson Duncan & Paradis (2020), and Sun et al. (2020) examined the effects of input quantity in bilingual communities yet left questions about the influence of home-based exposure unanswered. Similarly, studies emphasizing the role of balanced bilingual input, such as those by Li & Onnis (2022) and Zumaeta (2021) did not fully explore how unbalanced exposure or exclusive use of L2 in the home setting impacts language acquisition. These gaps suggest that there is a need for a deeper exploration of how advanced L2 proficiency is achieved in bilingual families where L2 is used primarily at home but not supported by external linguistic communities or institutional structures.

A significant gap in the literature also apply to to the role of parental strategies in language acquisition. While some studies, including those by Blume et al. (2022), Huber et al. (2023) and Sun & Ng (2021) have explored the influence of parental input on vocabulary development, they have not sufficiently addressed how these strategies impact more advanced aspects of language learning, such as grammar acquisition and pragmatic competence. Additionally, the role of parental language policies—strategies such as exclusive L2 use or curated language exposure—remains under-examined. These factors can be critical in facilitating advanced L2 proficiency, particularly in contexts where L2 is not the dominant community language.

Linguistic interference from L1, which is common in bilingual children, requires more detailed exploration. Studies on cross-linguistic influence (CLI) have examined how structural differences between languages impact bilingual learners, particularly with regard to syntax, morphology, and phonology (Çabuk-Ballı, 2023). However, the interaction between L1 interference and L2 acquisition in naturalistic, home-based bilingual contexts remains underexplored. In particular, the challenges posed by the structural differences between languages like Indonesian and English—such as differences in word order, tense marking, and subject-verb agreement—have not been fully investigated in the context of young bilinguals. Understanding how such interference affects language development, and how it is mitigated through immersive, home-based language strategies, is an area that requires further study.

A major theoretical framework guiding this study is Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis, which posits that language acquisition occurs most effectively when learners are exposed to comprehensible input slightly above their current level of competence (i+1). Krashen's theory highlights the importance of natural exposure to L2 in facilitating language acquisition, suggesting that language learners acquire grammatical structures and vocabulary not by explicit teaching but through understanding and internalizing language patterns. Cantas (2024), Huang (2020), and Salehomoum & Pearson (2020) emphasize that consistent exposure to language, particularly in naturalistic settings accelerates acquisition and supports the development of both receptive and productive skills**.** Venditti (2021) and Yuan (2021) suggest that comprehensible input can significantly enhance learners' grammatical accuracy and vocabulary acquisition when the input aligns with the learner's developmental stage in the critical period.

Lenneberg's (1967) Critical Period Hypothesis (CPH) asserts that there is an optimal window for language acquisition, typically before puberty, during which the brain is most receptive to learning languages. Lenneberg (1967) suggested that after this critical period, it becomes more difficult for individuals to achieve native-like proficiency in a second language.

D. Liu (2023) and Singleton (2005) support this hypothesis that younger learners tend to acquire more native-like phonology and grammar when exposed to a second language early in life. The ability to achieve fluency in a second language, particularly in phonological and grammatical aspects, is therefore believed to be linked to early exposure.

Interaction Hypothesis, proposed by Long (1981) offers another valuable framework for understanding how children acquire a second language. The hypothesis highlights the importance of meaningful interaction in language learning, suggesting that learners acquire language more effectively when they engage in communicative exchanges with more proficient speakers**.** Ding (2023) and Zhao Congmin (2021) support Long's hypothesis demonstrating that interaction not only helps learners improve their comprehension and production but also promotes deeper processing of language structures.

The concept of Cross-Linguistic Influence (CLI) is central to understanding bilingual development. CLI refers to the transfer of linguistic elements from one language to another, often manifesting as errors in grammar, vocabulary, or pronunciation. Language interference occurs when a learner applies the rules of their L1 to L2, leading to incorrect language use (Çabuk-Ballı, 2023). Van Dijk, Van Wonderen, et al., (2022) found that structural differences in word order, tense marking, and sentence construction between languages often lead to noticeable interference in early bilingual development.

Building on these theoretical perspectives, this study aims to address existing gaps by examining how children in bilingual families, where L2 is predominantly used at home but not in the wider community, achieve advanced proficiency in English. Given the importance of interaction in language acquisition and the challenges posed by cross-linguistic influence, this research explores two key questions: (1) How does L1, Indonesian Language, interfere with the child's English development? and (2) How do parental strategies contribute to the child's advanced English language development? By investigating these factors, this study seeks to provide a deeper understanding of bilingual language development in home-based learning environments.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a longitudinal intrinsic case study to examine a unique and specific case in great detail to gain a deep, comprehensive understanding of the particular case itself rather than using it to make generalizations about other cases. As Johnson & Stake (1996) suggests that an intrinsic case study is valuable when the researcher has a personal investment in exploring a case for its own sake, rather than using it as a tool to generalize to a broader population. The primary case is a seven-year-old bilingual child (codenamed Angel), whose early second language acquisition (ESLA) development is analyzed in depth.

This case is chosen due to its unique context: Angel is acquiring English as a second language in a home environment where English is used predominantly, yet without reinforcement from the wider community. This scenario presents an opportunity to investigate how parental strategies and immersive exposure contribute to advanced L2 proficiency in a setting where institutional or societal support is minimal. While this study focuses on a single case, its findings offer transferable insights for other bilingual families in similar linguistic environments, particularly those raising children in non-English-speaking countries with an emphasis on home-based L2 acquisition.

As a longitudinal study, data was collected over a period of several years (from the child's age of 1;09 (year; month) to 7;00 to capture the developmental trajectory of Angel's bilingual abilities. By tracking the evolution of her language skills, this study captures the nuances of her linguistic growth and how parental interventions and environmental factors influenced her English proficiency over time. In this study, the researcher's relationship with the subject—the

researcher's own daughter—allows for an intimate and contextually rich analysis of language acquisition in a family setting.

Participants

The primary participant in this study is Angel, a seven-year-old bilingual child who has been exposed to both Indonesian (L1) and English (L2) since early childhood. Angel was born in Indonesia and began receiving consistent exposure to Indonesian from birth, with English being introduced at age two. Given the researcher's close relationship with the subject, it is important to acknowledge potential biases in data interpretation. However, steps have been taken to maintain objectivity, including systematic data collection and analysis guided by established linguistic frameworks.

Angel's language development occurs within a family environment where multiple caregivers contribute to her bilingual exposure. Her father, a native speaker of Indonesian with advanced proficiency in English, is a university lecturer who uses English exclusively when interacting with Angel. His role in the language-learning process is fundamental, as he ensures consistent exposure to English through daily communication. Angel's mother, a native Indonesian speaker with limited proficiency in English, primarily speaks Indonesian with the child but actively supports her English learning through activities such as reading English books and watching English media. Additionally, Angel's older sibling, who speaks both Indonesian and English with a similar proficiency level in English, engages with her in both languages. While the brother's role is less central to Angel's language development, his interactions provide further insight into how language is used within a bilingual household.

Data Collection Methods

To provide a holistic and nuanced view of Angel's SLA process, this study employs multiple data collection methods**.** These methods include naturalistic observations**,** audio and video recordings**,** diary entries**,** and standardized language proficiency tests**.** To ensure the reliability of observational data, triangulation was employed by cross-referencing findings from different sources, such as recorded interactions, parental journals, and formal language assessments. Clear observational protocols were established to minimize researcher bias, including predefined categories for vocabulary use, grammatical structures, and fluency markers.

Naturalistic observations were conducted in Angel's home environment to document her language use in everyday situations, such as conversations with family members, play activities, and media consumption. Particular attention was given to her vocabulary usage, grammatical development, and fluency in spontaneous interactions. Parent-child interactions, especially between Angel and her father, were closely analyzed to examine scaffolding techniques, conversational patterns, and feedback mechanisms that contributed to her language development. These interactions were observed systematically, with efforts made to limit observer influence by capturing naturally occurring language exchanges without direct intervention.

Audio and video recordings served as a primary data source for tracking Angel's language production over time. A total of 78 recordings, amounting to 3,531 minutes of data, were collected from when Angel was 1;09 until she was 7;05. These recordings documented her spontaneous speech during daily activities, her engagement with English-language media, and her ability to construct full sentences in English. The recordings were captured using a high-fidelity Samsung cell phone video recorder, ensuring clear audio and video quality for accurate transcription and analysis. Transcriptions of these recordings were coded for recurring linguistic patterns, including syntax, morphological structures, and instances of cross-linguistic influence.

Diary entries and parental journals provided a longitudinal narrative of Angel's bilingual development, detailing language milestones, parental strategies, and observed instances of linguistic interference. To enhance the validity of self-reported data, parents were instructed to document observations objectively, focusing on concrete language behaviors rather than subjective impressions. These entries were later cross-referenced with recorded interactions and standardized language assessments to ensure consistency in reporting.

To measure Angel's formal proficiency in English, standardized language tests were administered during the study. When Angel was 7;05, she achieved CEFR B2-level proficiency in English. The CEFR B2 certification from EnglishScore (British Council) provides an objective measure of Angel's English skills, assessing her grammatical accuracy, vocabulary range, and listening comprehension. The test results provide a benchmark to assess her linguistic progress and the effectiveness of the home-based language learning environment.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis follows qualitative methods, focusing on identifying patterns and themes related to language development and parental strategies. Thematic analysis was employed to systematically identify recurring patterns in the observational data, diary entries, and parent-child interaction transcripts. This process involved coding data into key themes, such as language development milestones, parental involvement, and language interference, with explicit coding categories established to ensure consistency and reliability.

Language development milestones were analyzed by tracking key stages of vocabulary acquisition, grammatical development, and fluency, while parental involvement was examined to assess how specific strategies, such as scaffolding and corrective feedback, influenced Angel's English proficiency. Instances of Indonesian language interference were also documented, particularly in areas such as word order, grammatical structures, and direct lexical transfers, with excerpts from recorded observations providing concrete examples of these linguistic patterns.

Ethical considerations were carefully addressed, with informed consent obtained from the parents to ensure voluntary participation and ethical integrity. All data were anonymized and kept confidential to protect the participant's identity, and the study was designed to minimize disruption to the child's normal daily routine. Observations and recordings were conducted in a naturalistic and non-intrusive manner, ensuring that data collection did not interfere with the child's typical language use and development.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

The findings presented below highlight key linguistic milestones in Angel's language development, parental strategies for english language acquisition and the interference of indonesian in english language acquisition. By analyzing these factors, the research provides a deeper understanding of how bilingual children navigate the complexities of learning two languages simultaneously. The interplay between parental input, language exposure, and linguistic interference offers important implications for language development in bilingual contexts.

Linguistic Milestones

Table 1 shows the bilingual child's linguistic profile. The bilingual child (codenamed Angel) was born in Indonesia and received L1 Indonesian input since birth. Since her age 1;09, Angel started to receive Indonesian input for 7 hours and L2 English exposure for 1.5 hour per day. In 2020 during the Covid pandemic at 2;0, the child received more English as her father

had work for home and her English increased to 5 hours per day. At age 4;10, the child started to use full English everyday.

Table 1
Linguistic Milestones of Angel's Language Development

Age (Years; Months)	L1 Input (Hours/ Day)	L2 Input (Hours/ Day)	Context of Exposure	Interlocutors	Notable Linguistic Milestones
Birth to 1;09	8	0	Full-time exposure to Indonesian at home	Mother, Father, Brother	Exclusive L1 development, foundational vocabulary growth
1;09 to 2;00	7	1.5	Continued primary Indonesian exposure with limited English media and interaction	Mother, limited interaction with Father	Initial exposure to English through media and brief interactions
2;01 to 4;00	4	5	Increased English exposure due to father's work-from-home situation during the pandemic	Father, Mother, Brother	Gradual bilingual development, increasing vocabulary in both languages
4;01 to 4;09	3	6	Parents actively integrating English in daily routines and curated content exposure	Father, Mother, Brother	Balanced bilingualism, improved sentence structure in English
4;10 and onward	0	8	Full immersion in English as primary language at home	Father, Mother, Brother	Full English fluency in daily communication, milestones in literacy

Table 1 provides a chronological overview of Angel's language development, highlighting the balance between Indonesian and English exposure and its impact on her bilingual acquisition. Early in the study, from birth to 1;09, Angel's exposure to Indonesian was dominant, as expected for a child growing up in a monolingual home environment with both parents and her older brother speaking Indonesian. During this phase, her development was focused on building a foundation in L1 (Indonesian), with no exposure to English, which allowed her to develop a strong vocabulary and understanding of her native language. At this stage, the primary goal for her parents was to ensure that Angel had a solid grounding in her first language, which is typical for children raised in non-bilingual households.

From 1;09 to 2;00**,** English began to make **a** gradual introduction into Angel's daily life, primarily through limited media exposure (1.5 hours of English per day). This early exposure to English was not enough to cause any immediate shifts in language dominance, but it laid the groundwork for bilingual development. The role of media, such as cartoons or songs, was essential in exposing her to new English vocabulary and simple sentence structures. The fact that her exposure to English was still minimal compared to Indonesian, with English spoken intermittently by her father, suggests that bilingual development during this phase was in **its** infancy. Angel's linguistic development was to show interference from her primary language (Indonesian) at this stage, particularly in areas such as word order and grammar, as she was still in the process of acquiring the basic structure of both languages.

A marked shift in language input occurred from 2;01 to 4;00, particularly with the increased exposure to English due to the father's work-from-home situation during the pandemic. English input rose dramatically to 5 hours per da**y**, which, combined with daily interactions in both languages, facilitated the gradual development of bilingual competence. This period marks the time when Angel's language skills began to emerge more visibly in both English and Indonesian, with growing vocabulary in both languages. The increase in English exposure alongside continued Indonesian input led to balanced bilingualism, where she could engage in more complex conversations in English while still maintaining her proficiency in Indonesian.

This stage reflects the dynamic interaction between both languages and indicates that the child was beginning to establish a functional proficiency in both languages, with English becoming more prominent in her daily life. The key observation here is that bilingual children can thrive with quality and balanced exposure to both languages, especially when combined with scaffolded interaction and curated media input, which helped reinforce her English language skills.

Parental Strategies for English Language Acquisition

Table 2 below outlines a comprehensive framework of strategies adopted by parents to support their child's early English second language acquisition within a bilingual home environment. It specifies detailed activities under seven categories, each targeting key linguistic and cognitive domains necessary for proficiency development. Additionally, it includes practical measures such as the quantity of input provided daily, integrating technology, and tailoring content to the child's developmental needs. By systematically implementing these strategies, the parents were able to create a dynamic, engaging, and effective learning environment, culminating in the child's exceptional achievement of CEFR B2 proficiency by the age of seven.

Table 2
Parental Strategies and Practices

No.	Strategy Area	Specific Strategies	Description	Input (Hours /Day)	Type of Input	Freq.	Environment Context
1	Establishing Immersive Home Environments	Exclusive Use of English at Home	Parents communicated exclusively in English at home to ensure constant exposure and practice.	5–6 hours	Spoken language	Daily	Natural conversations during meals, and playtime.
		Curated English Media	The child accessed English books, educational TV shows, and apps for diverse linguistic input and cultural insights.	1–2 hours	Multimedia (audio/visual/text)	4–5 times weekly	Watching cartoons, reading books before bedtime.
2	Personalized Language Input	Age-Appropriate Content	English materials like storybooks, rhymes, and tools were chosen to match the child's age and interests.	1–2 hours	Text-based, auditory input	Daily	Storytime sessions and interactive games.
		Focus on Comprehensible Input	Language input was slightly above the child's proficiency (i+1) to challenge and engage comprehension.	1–2 hours	Spoken or textual input	Daily	Guided reading sessions, interactive tasks.
3	Promoting Interaction and Active Use of English	Encouraging Conversations	Parents engaged the child in detailed English conversations to enhance expressive skills.	1–2 hours	Spoken input and interaction	Daily	Discussions during meals or play.
		Role-Playing Activities	Role-playing scenarios like "store" or "teacher" were used to contextualize vocabulary and structures.	30–60 minutes	Contextual spoken input	Weekly	Structured play sessions at home.
		Playdates with English-Speaking Peers	Interactions with English-speaking peers provided additional conversational practice.	1–2 hours	Spoken, peer-interactive input	Monthly	Organized playdates or peer group meetings.

No.	Strategy Area	Specific Strategies	Description	Input (Hours /Day)	Type of Input	Freq.	Environment Context
4	Utilizing Technology and Online Resources	Interactive Apps and Games	Apps like Duolingo Kids enhanced vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation through interactive learning.	30–60 minutes	Multimedia (interactive)	4–5 times weekly	Screen-based interaction in a focused setting.
		Virtual Learning Opportunities	Enrolling in virtual English classes exposed the child to different accents and interactive lessons.	1–2 hours	Online spoken and textual input	Weekly	Virtual classroom setup.
5	Integrating English into Daily Routines	Narrating Daily Activities	Parents described daily activities in English to build contextual vocabulary.	1–2 hours	Spoken, contextual input	Daily	During household tasks, walks, or outings.
		Labeling Objects	Household items were labeled in English to reinforce vocabulary recognition naturally.	N/A	Visual input	Always	Around the home for passive exposure.
6	Encouraging Early Reading and Writing	Extensive Reading Activities	A structured reading program progressed from phonics to complex texts for comprehension growth.	1–2 hours	Textual input	Daily	Quiet reading sessions in a dedicated space.
		Guided Writing Activities	Early writing simple tasks like story composition supported written language skills.	30–60 minutes	Written input	2–3 times weekly	Supervised sessions at a study desk.
7	Maintaining Motivation and a Positive Attitude	Praise and Encouragement	Positive reinforcement motivated continued English learning.	N/A	Emotional and verbal input	Always	Integrated during any activity.
		Linking English to Fun Activities	Associating English with enjoyable activities ensured a positive view of learning.	30–60 minutes	Mixed (spoken, visual, auditory)	Weekly	During fun, engaging activities like songs or games.

The strategies employed by the parents in creating an immersive environment for language acquisition were foundational to her success in acquiring English. One of the most prominent strategies was the exclusive use of English at home. With 5 to 6 hours of spoken English input daily, Angel was constantly exposed to English through natural conversations during meals, playtime, and other family interactions. This full immersion ensured that Angel was regularly engaged with English in real-life contexts, which is a key principle of Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1982)**,** where constant exposure to comprehensible input helps reinforce language acquisition. In addition to this, the parents incorporated curated English media, such as books, TV shows, and educational apps. These media, totaling 1 to 2 hours per day, served as a form of multimedia input and provided her with a variety of linguistic and cultural experiences. This multimedia exposure was not only educational but also entertaining, making language learning enjoyable and relatable, further reinforcing Angel's English proficiency.

Personalized language input was another key component of the strategy. By using age-appropriate content, such as storybooks, rhymes, and interactive games, the parents ensured that the materials were engaging and matched Angel's developmental stage and interests. With 1 to 2 hours of text-based and auditory input each day, this approach helped Angel build

vocabulary and comprehension skills while maintaining her interest. The parents also prioritized comprehensible input, where the language input provided was just above Angel's current proficiency level (i+1), challenging her to understand and engage with more complex language structures. This strategy of providing slightly difficult input allowed Angel to push the boundaries of her language skills, increasing both her vocabulary range and her ability to understand and use more advanced linguistic structures.

The parents also promoted active use of English through structured interaction and play. Encouraging detailed conversations during meals, play, or other daily routines helped Angel develop her expressive language skills. These interactions, amounting to 1 to 2 hours daily, allowed her to practice and refine her speaking ability in varied contexts. Additionally, role-playing activities (e.g., playing "store" or "teacher") encouraged the use of new vocabulary and sentence structures in a fun and meaningful context. These activities not only reinforced language use but also helped her internalize English vocabulary by connecting it to real-life scenarios. Another important strategy was arranging playdates with English-speaking peers**,** which provided her with opportunities for peer interaction in English, further enhancing her conversational skills and exposing her to diverse speaking styles and accents. These interactions, typically 1 to 2 hours monthly, added a social dimension to her language learning, which is consistent with Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1996)**,** emphasizing the role of peer interaction in SLA.

The final set of strategies focused on the integration of technology and early literacy activities. Interactive apps and games, such as Duolingo Kids, provided her with interactive multimedia input for 30 to 60 minutes, 4 to 5 times a week. These activities helped develop her vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation in an engaging, game-based environment. The structured reading program, starting with phonics and progressing to more complex texts, played a significant role in her development of reading comprehension skills. The daily reading sessions, lasting 1 to 2 hours, encouraged her to engage with English texts of increasing difficulty. Guided writing activities further supported her literacy development, helping her move from simple tasks like writing short stories to more complex written compositions. Together, these strategies provided a well-rounded approach to language learning, targeting all aspects of English language acquisition: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

The Interference of L1 in L2 Acquisition

As a bilingual child exposed to both languages from an early age, Angel's English language development has been shaped by various linguistic features of Indonesian. These features, including syntax, word order, and lexicon, can interfere with her acquisition of English structures. The following table outlines specific areas where Indonesian interference has been observed in Angel's English language acquisition, illustrating how certain aspects of Indonesian grammar and language patterns impact her English production.

Table 3
The Child's L1 Interference in L2 Acquisition

No.	Area of Interference	Developmental Stage	Description of the Experience	Impact on English Acquisition
1	Lexicon	Early stages (1;09 to 2;00)	The child initially faced challenges distinguishing certain English words from their Indonesian equivalents due to semantic overlap.	The child sometimes substituted Indonesian words for their English counterparts, such as using "mobil" (Indonesian for car) when speaking in English, reflecting language transfer errors.
2	Syntactic	Early stages (1;09 to 2;00)	Indonesian syntax is more flexible in word order compared to English. This allows the child to construct	The child occasionally formed English sentences with incorrect word order, such as "She play in

No.	Area of Interference	Developmental Stage	Description of the Experience	Impact on English Acquisition
			sentences fluidly, but it also leads to errors in English sentence structure.	the garden?" instead of "She is playing in the garden?" (subject-verb inversion).
3	Word Order	Early to Middle stages (2;01 to 4;00)	Indonesian allows a more flexible word order, which does not alter the meaning of sentences. English, however, follows a strict Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) structure.	The child struggled with English word order. For instance, sometimes using subject-object inversion or omitting elements in sentences, e.g., "book she reading" instead of "She is reading a book."
4	Early Clauses Structure	Early stages (2;01 to 4;00)	Indonesian does not use auxiliary verbs to form questions or negatives, relying instead on word order and intonation.	The child omitted auxiliary verbs in early English questions. For example, "You like ice cream?" instead of "Do you like ice cream?" reflecting Indonesian syntax.
5	Subject-Verb Agreement	Early to Middle stages (2;01 to 4;00)	Indonesian does not require subject-verb agreement, leading to simplifications in verb forms in early English language development.	The child occasionally omitted the third-person singular "s" in English verbs, saying "She walk" instead of "She walks" and "She have+O" instead of "She has+O"
6	Null Subjects	Early stages (2;01 to 4;00)	Indonesian often omits the subject in sentences when it is implied or clear from the context, which is a common feature in pro-drop languages.	The child sometimes omitted subjects in English sentences, especially in early stages. For example, saying "Is raining" instead of "It is raining," reflecting Indonesian subject omission.
7	WH Movement	Middle stages (4;01 to 4;09)	In Indonesian, WH-questions follow a more straightforward word order, with the question word placed at the beginning without requiring auxiliary inversion.	The child struggled with the English WH-question structure. She often said "What you are doing?" instead of "What are you doing?" due to the lack of auxiliary inversion in Indonesian questions.
8	Auxless Questions	Middle to Late stages (4;10 to 6;01)	Indonesian frequently forms questions without the need for auxiliary verbs, unlike English, where auxiliary verbs are mandatory.	The child initially formed questions in English without auxiliary verbs, such as "He coming?" instead of "Is he coming?" This error resulted from the structure of questions in Indonesian.

Table 3 highlights several key areas of Indonesian interference observed in the child's English language acquisition. One significant area of interference was in the lexicon, where the child faced challenges distinguishing certain English words from their Indonesian equivalents due to semantic overlap. This led to occasional miscommunication. For instance, the child would sometimes substitute Indonesian words, such as "*mobil*" (meaning "car"), in place of their English counterparts. This language transfer error is typical of bilingual language learners, particularly in the early stages when the child has limited exposure to one of the languages and relies more on the first language for meaning-making.

In the syntactic domain, the child exhibited interference from Indonesian's more flexible word order compared to English, which has a rigid Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) structure. This flexibility in Indonesian allowed the child to form English sentences with incorrect word order**,** such as "Is playing she in the garden?**"** instead of **"**Is she playing in the garden?**".** This error reflects the child's tendency to transfer the syntactic structures from Indonesian, where word order is not as fixed, to English, where correct syntactic order is essential for clarity and grammatical accuracy.

Further interference was observed in the word order of English sentences, particularly as the child moved from the early to middle stages of language acquisition (2;01 to 4;00). In Indonesian, the word order is more flexible, allowing meaning to be conveyed even when elements of the sentence are reordered. In contrast, English requires a strict adherence to SVO structure. As a result, the child struggled with word order in English, sometimes producing sentences like " book she reading" instead of the correct "She is reading a book". This suggests that the child's syntactic knowledge was still in the process of adjusting to English sentence structure.

The child also exhibited interference in the formation of questions, particularly in terms of the early clauses structure and subject-verb agreement. Indonesian does not use auxiliary verbs for questions or negatives, which led the child to omit them in English. For example, the child would say "You like ice cream?" instead of "Do you like ice cream?". Additionally, the child omitted the third-person singular "s" in verbs, such as "She walk" instead of "She walks". These errors reflect a direct transfer of Indonesian's simpler verb conjugation rules and its reliance on word order rather than auxiliary verbs. Similarly, the child's use of null subjects was also influenced by Indonesian, which often omits the subject when it is clear from context. In English, the subject is typically required, which resulted in sentences like **"**Is raining**"** instead of **"**It is raining**,"** reflecting this syntactic interference.

Discussion

A key observation is the gradual shift towards balanced bilingualism, facilitated by increased exposure to the second language (L2) in specific contexts, such as during a parent's work-from-home period. This aligns with prior research that highlights the importance of consistent and balanced exposure to both languages in bilingual environments (Chang et al., 2023; Khotinets et al., 2022; Mishra et al., 2023). The marked increase in L2 exposure, combined with natural interactions in both languages, contributed to the development of functional bilingualism. The study supports the notion that bilingual children can thrive when both languages are nurtured with intentionality, particularly through a mix of conversational input and media exposure (Rastelli, 2023).

Another significant finding concerns the role of parental strategies in facilitating SLA. The parents' decision to use L2 exclusively at home, alongside curated media and technology, mirrors the language learning strategies identified in recent SLA literature (Alipour et al., 2023). Research on comprehensible input, particularly Krashen's (1985) input hypothesis emphasizes the importance of exposing children to language that is both understandable and slightly above their current proficiency. The parents' efforts to provide targeted linguistic input, such as interactive apps, storybooks, and virtual learning, exemplify how structured exposure can create a rich learning environment that fosters both linguistic and cognitive growth. This approach is in line with studies that emphasize the value of tailored content to enhance language development (Moran, 2022).

Despite the structured input, language interference from the first language (L1) was evident in several aspects of L2 acquisition, particularly in lexical choice and syntactic structures. Lexical interference, such as substituting L1 words for L2 equivalents, is a well-documented phenomenon in bilingual development (Feng et al., 2023). This occurs particularly in the early stages, when children are still building their L2 vocabulary and are more likely to rely on the structures and words of their dominant language. In this study, the substitution of L1 terms for L2 equivalents was observed. The language transfer is typical in bilingual development and generally decreases as proficiency in the second language increases (Qi & Biase, 2020)

Syntactic interference aligns with prior studies that document the influence of L1 grammar on L2 sentence structure. For example, the flexibility in word order in L1 (Indonesian) likely contributed to errors in the strict subject-verb-object (SVO) structure required in English.

Research has consistently shown that bilingual children transferring syntactic structures from their first language to the second is a common stage in language acquisition (Unsworth, 2023). The persistence of these errors in the early stages reflects the process of adjusting to the more rigid syntactic rules of the second language. As has been observed in similar studies, this type of interference tends to diminish as the learner becomes more familiar with the syntactic conventions of the second language (Stoehr & Martin, 2022).

The findings also emphasize the importance of integrating literacy development into the language acquisition process. Structured reading and writing activities were essential components of the language development environment, supporting both vocabulary acquisition and grammatical accuracy. This approach aligns with research emphasizing the importance of early literacy interventions in bilingual settings (Hur et al., 2020). This study provide further evidence that language interference is a natural and temporary part of bilingual language development. As expected, interference from L1 was particularly noticeable in the early stages of L2 acquisition. This phenomenon, however, should not be viewed negatively; rather, it is a sign of the learner's developing ability to navigate two language systems. Van Dijk, Dijkstra, et al., (2022) suggest that interference does not always result in permanent errors. Instead, it may reflect the learner's ongoing process of integration and accommodation of the second language. The interaction between languages can help learners refine their understanding of L2 grammar by highlighting the differences between the two languages. In practical terms, this means that bilingual children may initially make errors due to L1 interference, but these can be overcome through consistent exposure to the target language and corrective feedback from caregivers and teachers. The gradual reduction of such interference over time, as seen in this study, is consistent with findings in the literature on bilingualism, which suggest that interference typically decreases as the learner's proficiency in the second language increases (Henkin et al., 2023). Additionally, the parents' proactive strategies in providing rich, immersive input, combined with the child's exposure to both structured and naturalistic forms of L2 input, align with best practices for fostering bilingual proficiency.

CONCLUSION

This study provides insights into the processes underlying early bilingual language acquisition, particularly in the context of a bilingual home environment. The findings confirm that targeted parental strategies, personalize language input, and immersion in media and technology are essential for fostering bilingualism. By systematically integrating these strategies, the parents were able to create a rich, engaging learning environment that significantly contributed to the child's successful acquisition of English, culminating in CEFR B2 proficiency by the age of seven. Key to the child's progress was the provision of comprehensible input, a principle aligned with Krashen's Input Hypothesis, which stresses the importance of exposure to language that is slightly beyond the current proficiency level (i+1). The use of interactive media, structured reading, and guided play all served as effective tools in enhancing vocabulary, grammar, and comprehension. The integration of technology proved to be an invaluable supplement to traditional language learning practices. The inevitable linguistic interference from L1 particularly in the early stages of L2 acquisition is seen as a natural and temporary phase that diminishes over time as proficiency in the second language increases. This finding reinforces the view that bilingual children can achieve high levels of proficiency in both languages when both are nurtured with intention and balance. The parents' proactive strategies, combined with the child's exposure to a variety of linguistic inputs. The gradual reduction of interference over time supports the notion that language transfer is a natural aspect of bilingual development and that such interference does not hinder overall language growth.

These findings hold important implications for parents, educators, and policymakers. Parents seeking to raise bilingual children can implement structured exposure strategies, such as using interactive media, engaging in consistent target-language communication, and incorporating language-rich activities into daily routines. Educators can design curricula that support bilingual learners by integrating comprehension-based teaching methods and scaffolding techniques. Policymakers can promote early bilingual education initiatives, ensuring access to quality language-learning resources and fostering environments where bilingualism is actively encouraged and supported.

REFERENCES

Alipour, J., Khorshidi, S., & Hashemian, M. (2023). Iranian parents' attitudes towards their children's early additive bilingualism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2197870

Azieb, S., & Ben, M. S. (2021). The Critical Period Hypothesis in Second Language Acquisition: A Review of the Literature. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies*, *8*(4).

Blume, J., Park, S. J., Cox, M., & Mastergeorge, A. M. (2022). Explicating Child-Driven Patterns of Parent-Child Responsivity in Fragile Families: A Longitudinal Approach. *Frontiers in Pediatrics*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2022.813486

Boyarkina, I. (2020). *The role of interaction in second language acquisition.* https://doi.org/10.46646/sakh-2020-1-121-125

Çabuk-Ballı, S. (2023). Cross-linguistic influence in the acquisition of adpositions in L3. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *20*(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.1914061

Cantas, N. (2024). Negotiating family language policy: Emotional experiences and playful language input in heritage language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, *108*. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12897

Chang, C. C., Lin, W. L., & Kao, S. H. (2023). The Influences of Balanced Mandarin-English Bilinguals on Executive Function and Two Types of Creativity in Taiwanese University Students. *Journal of Research in Education Sciences*, *68*(4). https://doi.org/10.6209/JORIES.202312_68(4).0007

Ding, Z. (2023). Research on the Application of Language Input and Interaction Hypothesis in HSK Personalized Tutoring. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/2/2022318

Estremera, M. L. (2023). Input Hypothesis (Ih) Behind Morphosyntax Adeptness Index: Case Of L2 Learners From Applied Linguistics View. *Journal of Language & Linguistics Studies*, *19*(1).

Faraj, I. R., & Hamid, T. S. (2023). Differential Effects of Input Quantity and Input Quality on Bilingual Development: A Study with Kurdish–English Adolescents. *Languages*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8030220

Fei, S. (2023). An Application of the Input Hypothesis to the Teaching Design of English Reading Class in Senior High School. *Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Studies*, *5*(3). https://doi.org/10.22158/jetss.v5n3p38

Feng, J., Cho, S., & Luk, G. (2023). Assessing Theory of Mind in bilinguals: A scoping review on tasks and study designs. *Bilingualism*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728923000585

Henkin, R., Gafter, R., & Abu-Rabiah, E. (2023). Assessing change in syntactic features of Hebrew written by native Arabic speakers: a longitudinal study. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, *23*. https://doi.org/10.21248/l1esll.2023.23.1.399

Huang, X. (2020). An analysis of verbal humor in 2 broke girls from the perspective of conversational implicature. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *10*(8). https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1008.16

Huber, E., Ferjan Ramírez, N., Corrigan, N. M., & Kuhl, P. K. (2023). Parent coaching from 6 to 18 months improves child language outcomes through 30 months of age. *Developmental Science*, *26*(6). https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.13391

Hur, J. H., Snyder, P., & Reichow, B. (2020). Systematic Review of English Early Literacy Interventions for Children Who Are Dual Language Learners. In *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education* (Vol. 40, Issue 1). https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121419894623

Jansen, P. S. (2024). Exploring The Effects of English as a Foreign Language on First Language Development of Young Children: The Case of Greece. *International Journal of Education, Learning and Development*, *12*(2). https://doi.org/10.37745/ijeld.2013/vol12n24475

Johnson, K. E., & Stake, R. E. (1996). The Art of Case Study Research. *The Modern Language Journal*, *80*(4). https://doi.org/10.2307/329758

Kabha, L., & Berger, A. (2020). The sequence of acquisition for theory of mind concepts: The combined effect of both cultural and environmental factors. *Cognitive Development*, *54*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2020.100852

Khotinets, V., Shishova, E., Zinnurova, E., Kozhevnikova, O., Medvedeva, D., Novgorodova, Y., & Kumysheva, R. (2022). The Development of Cognitive Regulation in Connection with the Communicative Competence of Monolingual and Balanced Bilingual Children. *Education and Self Development*, *17*(3). https://doi.org/10.26907/esd.17.3.22

Krashen, S. D. (1985). The Input Hypothesis. In *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*.

Lenneberg, E. H. (1967). The Biological Foundations of Language. *Hospital Practice*, *2*(12). https://doi.org/10.1080/21548331.1967.11707799

Li, Y. (2023). Study on the Significance of the Input Hypothesis to English Teaching. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.54097/jeer.v3i2.9002

Li, Y., & Onnis, L. (2022). Properties of child-directed speech in bilingual parents A study on partial repetitions. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, *12*(6).

Liu, D. (2023). The Critical-Period Hypothesis and its Implications from Western Scholars. *SHS Web of Conferences*, *157*. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202315703017

Long, M. H. (1981). Input, Interaction, and Second-Language Acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *379*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1981.tb42014.x

Lucas, C. M. P. C. (2022). Teaching English to Young Learners: Second Language Acquisition or Foreign Language Learning? - A Case Study. *World Journal of English Language*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.5430/WJEL.V12N1P50

Luo, Z. (2024). A Review of Krashen's Input Theory. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *26*. https://doi.org/10.54097/3fnf5786

Mishra, K. A., Asthana, H. S., & Singh, I. L. (2023). The dynamic role of inhibitory control in language switching during number-word task performance in dominant and balanced bilinguals. *Cognitive Processing*, *24*(3). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-023-01142-4

Moran, J. (2022). Comprehending Comprehensible Input (CI): Some Observations. *Journal of Classics Teaching*, *23*(46). https://doi.org/10.1017/S2058631021000799

Nikolaus, M., & Fourtassi, A. (2023). Communicative Feedback in language acquisition. *New Ideas in Psychology*, *68*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2022.100985

Paradis, J. (2011). The impact of input factors on bilingual development: Quantity versus quality. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, *1*.

Qi, R., & Biase, B. Di. (2020). The influence of the environmental language (Lε) in Mandarin-English bilingual development: The case of transfer in wh- questions. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *24*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006919876716

Rastelli, S. (2023). Noncombinatorial grammar: A challenge for memory research on second language acquisition and bilingualism. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *65*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2022.101112

Salehomoum, M., & Pearson, P. D. (2020). Becoming a Great Reader: One Deaf Student's Journey. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *63*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1011

Singleton, D. (2005). The Critical Period Hypothesis: A coat of many colours. In *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* (Vol. 43, Issue 4). https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2005.43.4.269

Singleton, D., & Leśniewska, J. (2021). The critical period hypothesis for L2 acquisition: An unfalsifiable embarrassment? In *Languages* (Vol. 6, Issue 3). https://doi.org/10.3390/languages6030149

Sorenson Duncan, T., & Paradis, J. (2020). How does maternal education influence the linguistic environment supporting bilingual language development in child second language learners of English? *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *24*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006918768366

Stoehr, A., & Martin, C. D. (2022). Orthography affects L1 and L2 speech perception but not production in early bilinguals. *Bilingualism*, *25*(1). https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728921000523

Sun, H., & Ng, E. L. (2021). Home and school factors in early English language development. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *41*(4). https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1932742

Sun, H., Ng, S. C., O'Brien, B. A., & Fritzsche, T. (2020). Child, family, and school factors in bilingual preschoolers' vocabulary development in heritage languages. *Journal of Child Language*, *47*(4). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000919000904

Supramaniam, K., & Shahirah, W. (2022). Second Language Acquisition Opportunities during Digital Game Interactions. *Asian Journal of University Education*, *18*(4). https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v18i4.20041

Unsworth, S. (2023). Shared syntax and cross-linguistic influence in bilingual children. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*. https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.22093.uns

Van Dijk, C., Dijkstra, T., & Unsworth, S. (2022). Cross-linguistic influence during online sentence processing in bilingual children. *Bilingualism*, *25*(4). https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728922000050

Van Dijk, C., Van Wonderen, E., Koutamanis, E., Kootstra, G. J., Dijkstra, T., & Unsworth, S. (2022). Cross-linguistic influence in simultaneous and early sequential bilingual children: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Child Language*, *49*(5). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000921000337

Venditti, E. (2021). Using Comprehensible Input in the Latin Classroom to Enhance Language Proficiency. *Journal of Classics Teaching*, *22*(43). https://doi.org/10.1017/S2058631021000039

Yuan, Y. (2021). Influence of native language transfer on senior high school english writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1102.08

ZHAO Congmin. (2021). Fundamental Theories of Second Language Acquisition: The Input Hypothesis, the Output hypothesis, and the Interaction Hypothesis. *Sino-US English Teaching*, *18*(7). https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8072/2021.07.003

Zokhida, T. S., Kizi, J. D. I., Djumaeva, G. A., & Juraeva, Y. R. (2020). Critical period hypothesis in acquiring the second language: The case of two Uzbek students. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, *7*(7). https://doi.org/10.31838/jcr.07.07.159

Zumaeta, D.-A. H. (2021). A study to identify perspectives of bilingual school teachers regarding reading comprehension strategies and how these increase reading comprehension proficiency. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *14*(1).

APPENDICES

Angel's CEFR B2 from English Score British Council