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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALM</td>
<td>Audiolingual Language Teaching Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Adjective Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFLA</td>
<td>Bilingual First Language Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSM</td>
<td>Bilingual Syntax Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Contrastive Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Corrective Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Clarification Request (what)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>Communicative Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>Determiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMFonF</td>
<td>Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Error Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (+)</td>
<td>Teacher's explicit correction (+form/EXPL) (NOT this but THAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>English as a foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAN</td>
<td>Eudico Linguistic Annotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Explanation Request (why)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+FB</td>
<td>Positive Feedback (+form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonF</td>
<td>Focus on Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonFs</td>
<td>Focus on Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM+</td>
<td>Provides form (+in FonF schedule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>First-year class of kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>Second-year class of kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KWIC</td>
<td>Key Word in Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second Language, any language learned after the first language is in place in any setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFG</td>
<td>Lexical Functional Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLU</td>
<td>Mean Length of Utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoEC</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>No Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoM</td>
<td>Negotiation of Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Native Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other input enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Processability Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{R</td>
<td>Recast (+stress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Request Repetition (individual or choral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{RW (+)</td>
<td>Repeat wrong form (stress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBLT</td>
<td>Task-based Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Target Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>Total Physical Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Standard English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Second Language Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>Subject-Verb-Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Time 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZISA</td>
<td>Zweitspracherwerb Italienischer und Spanischer Arbeiter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

This thesis is an investigation of how Indonesian kindergarten children develop their English as a foreign language (EFL) through classroom interaction. It does this by examining the acquisition of their early English lexicon and grammatical development, with a focus on plural expressions. The data were collected in a kindergarten located in Bandung, the capital city of West Java province where many languages are used in everyday life. The kindergarten in this study offers a three-hour English L2 program each school day with rather broad guidelines consisting of weekly themes in line with the general kindergarten educational program rather than proposing detailed linguistic modules.

To achieve the current thesis aim, a one-semester longitudinal quasi-experimental classroom-based study was conducted, within the kindergarten’s broadly meaning-based program, with 20 pupils. The experimental component involved English learning modules, which were developmentally moderated, that is, they were based on the current stage of English development of the children. This Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form (DMFonF) component, modelled on Di Biase (2002, 2008), included a pre-test, an intervention period, and a post-test. For its analytical framework, the study draws on Processability Theory (PT) (Pienemann, 1998) and Interactionist approaches, specifically and approach to feedback termed Focus-on-Form (Long, 1991; Long & Robinson, 1998). Two intact kindergarten classes, K1 (first year), and K2 (second year), each with 10 pupils, participated in the study. Both classes received DMFonF instruction, for approximately 20-25 minutes twice a week within
their three hours of communicative meaning-based English program, over a period of 12 weeks. A delayed post-test was conducted six months after the post-test to check whether the children had maintained their lexical and grammatical knowledge.

This study also observed, via video-recordings of classroom interaction, the teacher’s linguistic behaviour over the course of the intervention, paying particular attention to how the teacher offers feedback to the children.

A further aim of this project was to canvass teacher’s and parents’ perceptions of the children learning English L2. To this end, a semi-structured interview was conducted with the teacher of English centred around her strategies and practices deployed to support learning in the classroom. Parents were also asked, through a questionnaire and interviews about their choice of kindergarten for their child, the motivation, the practice of English at home and informal opportunities available within the family environment and outside the school to support their children’s learning of English.

The study reveals that all the children, regardless of the time they had been involved in the English program, were at the single-word stage at the beginning of the experiment. They all acquired plural marking by the end of the DMFonF intervention, as well as increased their lexicon. Most of them also acquired plural agreement within the Noun Phrase. Six months after the post-test, children maintained their lexical and grammatical knowledge of English. This suggests that DMFonF and feedback are effective in promoting grammatical as well as lexical development in a second language and enable the teacher to create opportunities to pay attention to form and increase accuracy. Also, the study found that both teacher’s and parents’ perceptions were positive regarding the English L2 program.
This study contributes fresh evidence to the field of SLA through a longitudinal study of English lexical and grammatical development in Indonesian kindergarten children, confirming results in other second languages, such as Di Biase (2002) with Italian, and expanding the DM FonF database. Thus, this study encourages L2 teachers to provide a more detailed syllabus construction of L2 structures and focusing strategies based on the current development of the pupils. Parents’ informal support and aspirations for their children may contribute to strengthening the children’s capital and learning of English L2 outside the classroom.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to examine the language development in English as a foreign language (EFL) among Indonesian kindergarten children within the framework of Processability Theory (PT). Indonesia is a multilingual country where the national language and various local languages are all in current use. English in Indonesia is a foreign language to be used for specific purposes. In the formal education system, English is a compulsory subject from secondary school to university level (Nababan, 1991; Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Sulistiyo, 2015; Widodo, 2016). English may also be taught as an optional subject in primary schools (Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Widodo, 2016). Interestingly, some kindergartens, particularly in metropolitan areas such as Bandung, include English within their curriculum. Many parents from middle-class backgrounds, who are aware of the importance of English, choose to send their children to these schools (Djuharie, 2011; Ananthia, 2015). In a linguistically complex country such as Indonesia, learning English is recognised as beneficial, and challenging, for both learners and teachers.

This thesis details a longitudinal quasi-experimental classroom-based study of 20 Indonesian kindergarten children acquiring English lexical and grammatical structures over one school semester. Specifically, this study focuses on the acquisition

---

1 Middle-class in this thesis refers to wealthy social groups where “the common basis of their social power and position is increasingly capital, credentials and expertise rather than rent or position in the state apparatus or a feudal hierarchy …” (Robison & Goodman, 1996, p. 5).
of English plural marking on nouns using a pre-test, intervention, and post-test. Six months after the post-test, a delayed post-test was employed cross-sectionally to check whether the children still maintained their lexical and grammatical knowledge after the intervention. This study also analyses the teacher’s linguistic behaviour during the intervention. This is important because the teacher’s input and feedback are crucial in achieving successful learning.

The research took place in a kindergarten located in a middle-class residential area in Bandung, West Java Province, Indonesia. The language situation in Bandung, one of Indonesia’s most populous cities, is complex. Bandung is a multilingual metropolitan city where many languages are in everyday use. The array of languages in use makes it difficult for Sundanese, the local vernacular, to maintain its high position and vitality (Indrayani, 2011).

The children observed in this study learn English L2 in the kindergarten for three hours each school day. The kindergarten provides guidelines consisting of weekly themes such as colours; fruit and vegetables; and animals, which align with the general kindergarten educational program based on the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia (2014). Therefore, the teachers construct the details of the English L2 syllabus based on the themes from the kindergarten curriculum without any linguistic modules. In delivering the English L2 program, teachers use both English and Indonesian as instructional languages.

Given the broad and extensive history of second language acquisition (SLA) research (e.g., Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991; Doughty & Long 2003; Long &

---

2 The term L2 is used here, and throughout the chapter, to refer to any language learned after the first language is in place in any setting (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, Doughty & Long, 2003), including the Indonesian EFL setting.
Doughty 2009; Arntzen et al., 2019), there might be a significant advantage for kindergarten educators to take on board the available linguistic knowledge and resources. Studies focusing on the acquisition of plural marking in English L2 involving children are, however, limited, particularly in Indonesian kindergarten contexts (with the exception of Hardini, et al., 2019³, 2020⁴; Hardini, et al., in press⁵) and Processability Theory studies of children learning English are mostly in the context of bilingual first language acquisition (BFLA) (Itani-Adams, 2007; Mohamed Salleh et al, 2016; Mohamed Salleh, 2017), except for Yamaguchi (2010) and Di Biase et al (2015), who studied English L2 learning in a primary school-age Japanese child. All these studies investigate children learning English in naturalistic environments, whereas the present study examines the learning of English L2 by pre-school-aged children in an instructed setting. Opportunities to interact with native speakers of English in the natural Indonesian setting are rare. Hence, to maximise learning opportunities, instructed second language learning becomes important (Long, 1987). The current study contributes to SLA research by bridging theoretical and methodological gaps.

The current research is designed within a Processability Theory (PT) framework (Pienemann, 1998), in combination with the notion of Focus on Form (FonF) (Long, 1991). Processability Theory provides a metric for second language development while FonF provides a methodological orientation for the classroom. This means that the two theoretical approaches allow for a specification of what language elements to
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focus on at what particular development point of the learner’s developmental path. This study applies a quasi-experimental design, as devised by Di Biase (2002, 2008) who investigated grammatical development in children (seven to nine years old) learning Italian L2 in Australian primary schools, to the Indonesian kindergarten classroom. Di Biase’s design is characterised as Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form (DMFonF), an L2 instructional component, which uses PT schedules as its primary syllabus framework, focusing on specific forms for its implementation within a communicative or task-based program. Further details on this kind of instruction will be treated in the chapter devoted to method.

A further aim of the current thesis is to explore the teacher’s and parents’ perceptions of the children learning English, as well as the degree of family support for learning English at home. Teacher’s perceptions of the English L2 program are explored through an interview to explicate the strategies and practices the teacher uses to support the children’s English L2 learning in the classroom. Parents’ perceptions are explored through a questionnaire and interviews regarding the English L2 program in recognition of the fact that L2 learning may well go beyond the classroom walls. Its success is assumed to depend, at least in part, on the support and encouragement provided outside the classroom, particularly the informal support and opportunities the family may provide to fortify the children’s learning of English.

The remainder of the thesis is organised as follows. Chapter 2 discusses English education in Indonesia and the linguistic context of the participants. Chapter 3 presents the theoretical and literature background of this study and identifies the research gap, the research questions and the hypothesis explored in this study. Chapter 4 details the research design, which includes the research method, participants, data collection and the method used for data analysis. Chapter 5 presents the linguistic results of the
instructional experiment carried out and discusses the effects of Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form (DMFonF) instruction. A later section of this chapter presents an analysis of the teacher’s linguistic behaviour and it concludes with a general discussion of the linguistic results.

Chapter 6 presents the analysis of the teacher’s and parents’ perceptions of the children learning English L2. Then, the results of the semi-structured interviews with parents on their perceptions and informal opportunities for the children learning English L2 are discussed. Chapter 7, the final chapter, concludes the thesis by summarising the way in which the research findings respond to the research questions and hypotheses formulated in Chapter 3, followed by a brief discussion of the theoretical and practical implications of this study. This final chapter also discusses the contributions of the current findings to the field of SLA pedagogy and early ESL/EFL instruction as well as pointing out the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2. LANGUAGE BACKGROUND AND ENGLISH EDUCATION IN INDONESIA

This chapter presents the background of language and English education, particularly English language teaching and learning, in Indonesia. The chapter is organised as follows. Section 2.1 describes the language situation in Indonesia as a multilingual country. This section presents the three categories of the language used in Indonesia, including the status and functions of the national, the vernaculars, and the foreign languages, particularly English. Section 2.2 details English education in Indonesia policy focusing on the English program in kindergarten. Section 2.3 describes the linguistic context of the participants, including Indonesian, Sundanese, and English as the languages involved in this study. It summarises the typological differences of Indonesian, Sundanese, and English, focusing on the way the three languages mark plurality. Section 2.4 reviews some theories relating to the importance of learning English, briefly explaining why parents want their children to learn English. Bourdieu’s forms of capital, globalisation, and cosmopolitanism are canvassed to understand the opportunity for children to learn English outside of school. Finally, section 2.5 concludes the chapter.
2.1 The language situation in Indonesia

Indonesia, a country in Southeast Asia with a population of more than 260 million in 2020, is known as a multilingual and multicultural country (Paauw, 2009; Widodo & Fardhani, 2011; Widodo, 2016; Badan Pusat Statistik/Statistics Indonesia, 2020). Indonesia has over 300 ethnic groups and 750 local languages (Garnaut, 2012; Turner, 2018; Ministry of Education and Culture, 2019). The great diversity of languages and cultures is reflected in the nation’s motto ‘Unity in Diversity’ (Bhinneka Tunggal Ika) (Nababan, 1985, 1991).

The languages spoken in Indonesia fall into three categories: the national language, local or regional languages, and foreign languages (Nababan, 1985, 1991; Montolalu & Suryadinata, 2007). Indonesian language or Bahasa Indonesia, which originated from the Malay language of Northeast Sumatra, was declared to be the national language on October 28, 1928, when the Congress of Indonesian Youth proclaimed one nation and fatherland (Embassy of Indonesia, 1964; Montolalu & Suryadinata, 2007). It became the official national language when Indonesia proclaimed its independence in 1945, as stipulated in article 36 of the 1945 Constitution (Embassy of Indonesia, 1964; Montolalu & Suryadinata, 2007; Hellwig & Tagliacozzo, 2009). Since then, the Indonesian language performs its function as the State’s formal language and it is used for communication between different Indonesian ethnic groups as well as the language instruction in the formal education system (Nababan, 1991; Montolalu & Suryadinata, 2007). The local or regional languages, also called vernaculars (e.g., Javanese, Sundanese, Madurese), are used for unofficial intra-ethnic communication and local cultural events (Nababan, 1991; Montolalu & Suryadinata, 2007). Foreign languages such as English, Arabic, French, Japanese are used for international communication (Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Widodo,
Therefore, multilingualism exists and ‘Bahasa Indonesia’ as the national language unifies the diverse population in Indonesia.

**Multilingualism in Indonesia**

According to the 2010 national census data, most of the Indonesian population speak vernacular languages (79.45%), followed by the Indonesian language (19.94%) and foreign languages (0.35%) for daily communication at home (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2010). Currently, it is estimated that a total of 43 million people (16%) speak Indonesian as a first language and another 156 million (60%) speak one of the vernaculars as a second language (Ethnologue, 2019; Low, 2020). This means that not all Indonesians speak the Indonesian language as the first language. There are still many Indonesians whose first language is vernacular, and they learn Indonesian as the second language or vice versa.

**The status and function of English in Indonesia**

Since English is the focus of this study, this section describes the status of English as a foreign language and its function in Indonesia today. The term English as a foreign language (EFL) is applied in countries such as China, Thailand, and Japan. It is also used in Indonesia, where English is used by a smaller percentage of people and for a limited range of international communication purposes (Lowenberg, 1991; Crystal, 2003). Moreover, English is not used in official domains such as government, the law courts and the education system (Simatupang, 1999).

This fits with Kachru’s categorisation of English speakers in the world (1992), and Indonesia’s classification as being within the expanding circle. This means that the expanding circle consists of countries where English is used as “the primary foreign language” (Kachru, 1992, p. 3) and has no official status (Crystal, 2003).
After Indonesia obtained its independence in 1945, the Indonesian Government decided to include English as a compulsory subject in secondary schools, although the Dutch colonised Indonesia for more than 350 years (Nababan, 1991; Widodo, 2016). English became the first foreign language since the 1950s until today for broader communication (Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Renandya, 2004) and is rarely used socially because it is not the first language (Lauder, 2008). Its function is therefore a means of international communication in all fields, including scientific knowledge, technological gains, business, and library language (Nababan, 1991; Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Renandya, 2004; Lauder, 2008). This linguistic cosmopolitanisation of everyday life will be discussed in Section 2.4.

### 2.2 English education in Indonesia

English was first introduced as a school subject and was chosen as the only compulsory foreign language in secondary schools in the late 1960s (Nababan, 1991; Renandya, 2004; Lauder, 2008; Widodo, 2016; Kohler, 2019; Low, 2020). Other foreign languages such as French, German, and Japanese are taught as optional subjects in high schools (Renandya, 2004). The purpose of learning foreign languages is to understand different cultural experiences and to prepare students for their future education (Nababan, 1991).

Since 1994, the Ministry of Education has allowed elementary schools to teach English from fourth to sixth-grade students if the school can afford the cost (Dardjowidjojo, 2000, p. 26). This means that primary schools can include English if they have enough funding for the English program and if they wish to choose it (Lie, 2017). However, some fee-paying preschools, including kindergartens, particularly in the metropolitan cities, teach English as part of the curriculum. English programs at
kindergartens are trying to fulfill the demands of parents who realise the importance of English as a global language, for their children’s future professional development (Ananthia, 2015; Ananthia, Harun & Silawati, 2015).

**English programs in early childhood education**

In Indonesia, unlike Australia, kindergartens are separate from Year 1 to Year 6 primary school and have their own buildings, principals, teachers, and staff members. In this sense, kindergartens in Indonesia are like preschools (Ministry of National Education, 2011; OECD/ADB, 2015). Kindergarten in Indonesia extends for two years; also, unlike Australia where it is only for one year— although preschool education can be from birth to four or five years (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2020). Teaching and learning processes in both public and private kindergartens in Indonesia are supervised by the Directorate General of Early Childhood Education and Community Education (2016) under the Ministry of Education and Culture, which also regulates child care and playgroups, both formal and informal. This study was held in a private fee-paying kindergarten in Bandung that offers English as part of the school curriculum.

The Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC) in Indonesia regulates the curriculum for the National Standard of Early Childhood Education (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2014).) Early childhood education is defined as the time period from birth to the age of six (Ministry of National Education, 2011). However, the MoEC does not regulate the English curriculum for preschools and primary schools (Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015). Therefore, schools that offer English programs need to develop their curriculum or adapt the curriculum from other English-speaking countries (Jayanti & Norahmi, 2015).
The English L2 curriculum in the kindergarten in this study was developed by the teachers and the school. The school establishes the themes for the English program that align with the general kindergarten educational program, however, there are no detailed linguistic modules in the syllabus. Therefore, the teacher works out the details of the syllabus based on the themes given by the school.

In delivering the English program, teachers apply a communicative language teaching approach in the meaning-based classroom. According to Hymes (1972), communicative language teaching (CLT) can incorporate sociolinguistic rules, or the properness of an utterance, in addition to grammar rules to promote communicative competence in language teaching contexts (Hymes, 1972). The teachers typically use the learning material, which includes a considerable amount of lexicon and no grammar. They also use song, stories, games, and fun activities to motivate children to learn English.

### 2.3 Linguistic context of the participants

The language context of this study involves three languages: Indonesian, Sundanese, and English. As explained in Section 2.1 Indonesian is the national and official language whereas Sundanese is the local language in the context of this study. English as a target language is the foreign language in Indonesia.

Bandung, the research setting of this study, is the capital of West Java province and Indonesia’s third largest city after Jakarta and Surabaya (Wieringa, 2002; Badan Pusat Statistik Kota Bandung, 2015). Bandung, as the homeland of Sundanese people, is located close to the national capital, Jakarta. The Sundanese language, as spoken in and around Bandung, is the second largest vernacular language after Javanese, which
is widely used by the West Java community for daily conversation (Wieringa, 2002; Indrayani, 2011).

Bandung was a Dutch colonial city, also called the ‘Paris of Java’ because it had a strong resemblance to European cities and became an educational centre in the colonial period with the opening of the Bandung Institute of Technology in 1920 as the first Dutch-founded university for Indonesians (Wieringa, 2002, Rosyad, 2007). In 1955, the first Asian-African Conference was hosted in Bandung, and English was used as the official language of the conference (Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations, 1960; Wieringa, 2002).

Bandung is also known as a student city where many higher education institutions were founded. This attracts many students and lecturers from other places to come to the city (Rosyad, 2007; Barlian & Manurung, 2019). Bandung has been successful in enticing large domestic, foreign investments and local businesses such as tourism, manufacturing, food, entertainment and has made Bandung a metropolitan area (Firman, 2009; Tarigan et al., 2016). This has resulted in the local government of Bandung City becoming aware of globalisation and its challenges, including the importance of English as a global language. For instance, in 2015, the Bandung government launched a program, ‘Kamis Inggris’, which recommended to every element of Bandung citizen, from the government officers to students and teachers in school contexts, to speak English on Thursday (Ananthia, 2015; Ananthia, Harun & Silawati, 2015; Humas Kota Bandung, 2018). The program encouraged several kindergartens in Bandung to introduce English to children on that day (Ananthia, et al., 2015).

The language situation in Bandung is complex. Given its multicultural diversity, Bandung is a multilingual, metropolitan city where many languages are in everyday
use, which makes it difficult for Sundanese, the local vernacular, to maintain its high position and its vitality (Indrayani, 2011). As well as the other vernaculars, Sundanese must compete with Indonesian and English. Interestingly, the provincial government has recently instructed schools in the West Java area, including kindergartens, to teach Sundanese for at least two hours per week (Government of West Java Province, 2003, 2013, 2014). Indonesian, in any case, is the language used to instruct children in Indonesian kindergarten classrooms and the focus for Indonesian L1 learners in the early years of kindergarten is to strengthen children’s understanding of reading and writing Indonesian.

As for the spoken language, seven out of the 20 families of participating children have L1 Sundanese, but only one of these families indicated their child had Sundanese as L1 and was learning Indonesian as an L2. Also, there are some parents who have either Javanese or Palembangnese as their L1, but they speak Indonesian at home with the children. More than half of the participants in the current study live in nuclear families; the rest of them live in extended families. They are likely to use Indonesian with their parents and grandparents. Detailed explanations of the parents’ response to the questionnaire are provided in Chapter 6.

The following subsection provides a brief description of typological differences of Indonesian, Sundanese and English that is pertinent to the study. The morphological and syntactic descriptions will be presented first, followed by the plurality in the three languages.
2.3.1 Typological description of linguistic characteristic of Indonesian, Sundanese and English

Indonesian and Sundanese are categorised as belonging to the Western-Malayo Polynesian branch of the Austronesian family (Tadmor, 2009). English, the target language, belongs to the Germanic group of the Indo-European family (Hawkins, 2009).

Morphologically, Indonesian and Sundanese are considered as agglutinative languages (Robins, 1959; Phillips, 1973; Comrie, 1989). This means that the form of words includes prefixes, infixes, and suffixes to roots as a constant structure (Robins, 1959). The major morphological processes in Indonesian and Sundanese are affixation, compounding and reduplication (Tadmor, 2009; Robins, 1959). However, Goddard (2005) states, “most East and Southeast Asian languages are isolating in type and lack inflection” (p.109). This means that Indonesian and Sundanese may appear to be isolating languages. There are no inflectional morphology and grammatical categories (e.g., for tense, number, case, gender, and articles) in both languages unlike English (Svalberg and Chuchu, 1998; Soriente, 2007). For example, the noun mingguan in Indonesian and minggonan in Sundanese, which mean weekly, is derived from base form minggu (Indonesian) and minggo (Sundanese) which mean ‘week’ and suffix -an.

Syntactically, Indonesian and Sundanese are classified as Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) languages (Robins, 1968; Sudaryanto, 1983). Both languages allow for a flexible word order (Robins, 1968; Soriente, 2007). Example (1) indicates the basic SOV word order in Indonesian (Kroeger, 2005).

(1) *Ahmad makan nasi.*
   Ahmad    eat    rice
   S        V      O
   ‘Ahmad is eating rice.’
Sundanese is also an SVO language as in exemplified in (2). Sundanese sentences can be formed as either equational or verbal. Equational sentences “consist basically of two noun elements (or, by expansion, of two nominal phrases or nominal groups); the first noun element, in unmarked sentences, may be a pronoun” (Robins, 1968, p. 352) as in (3).

(2) *Murid mawa buku*

pupil (N) carry (V) book (N)

‘The pupil carries the book’.

(3) *Manehna pradʒurit*

3rd person Sing (is) soldier

‘He is a soldier’.

In terms of noun phrase in Indonesian, Mintz (2002) states that it may consist of a noun as its head word combines with personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, noun, number and adjective. Numerical or other quantitative specifiers are placed before the noun as in (4) but adjectival modifiers, unlike English, are placed after the noun as in (5).

(4) *dua anjing*

number (two) noun (dog)

‘two dogs’

(5) *mobil merah*

noun (car) adjective (red)

‘red car’

Noun phrase in Sundanese consists of a noun as its head word combined with adjective, demonstrative and numerical or indefinite quantifiers (cf., Hardjadibrata, 1985) like Indonesian as in (6-8). Notice that, unlike English, in the presence of a quantifier, the noun form does not mark plural number.

(6) *buku anyar*

book (noun) new (adjective)

‘new book’
Turning now to English, the target language in this current study, English has the same basic word order like Indonesian and Sundanese, that is, Subject Verb Object (SVO) (Finegan, 2009) as in example (9) below.

(9) John reads a book.

English is categorised, morphologically, as an inflectional language (Carstairs-McCarthy, 2002). For example, a verb *sing* (present/V₁) can be formed to be *sang* (past tense/V₂), *sung* (past participle/V₃), and *singer* (noun).

According to Kroeger (2005), a noun phrase in English usually begins with a determiner (*a, the, this, that*) following an adjective and a noun. The head of the phrase depends on the phrasal category, such as a noun phrase (NP) and will be headed by a noun as in (10) or an adjective phrase (AP) by an adjective as in (11) (Kroeger, 2005).

However, in noun phrases, the position of the adjective is before the noun as in (10), unlike Indonesian and Sundanese.

(10) a red apple

(11) You have a (very beautiful) daughter.

2.3.2 Plurality in Indonesian, Sundanese, and English

The current study investigates acquisition of English plural expressions by Indonesian kindergarten children. Therefore, this subsection describes expressions of plurality in Indonesian, Sundanese, and English. These three languages are relevant to the
participating children and different ways of expressing plurality in these languages may cause some learning difficulties.

The concept of number in English is expressed through the marking of singular-plural contrasts (e.g., *a cat/some cats*), quantifiers (e.g., *some, many, all*), classifiers and measure words (e.g., *piece, bit, pound*) (Corbett, 2000; Barner, Lui, & Zapf, 2012). However, there are several differences in the expression of plurality in the three languages of this study.

Indonesian and Sundanese, like most languages in Southeast Asia, are classified as optionally marking plural in nouns denoting human, non-human animate, and inanimate nouns (Haspelmath, 2013). Indonesian and Sundanese, unlike English, do not differentiate between countable and uncountable nouns (Dalrymple & Mofu, 2012).

Plurality in Indonesian is expressed in various forms of reduplication such as *rumah-rumah* ‘houses’, *lauk-pauk* ‘side dishes’, or *buah-buahan* ‘fruits’ (Dardjowidjojo & MacDonald, 1967; Sneddon, et al., 2012). Indonesian plurals may optionally involve phrasal constructions with numeral classifiers, namely *orang* ‘person’ for people, *ekor* ‘tail’ for animals and *buah* ‘fruit’ for everything else” (Dalrymple & Mofu, 2012, p. 230). Quantifiers, such as *sedikit* ‘a few’, *beberapa* ‘some’, *banyak* ‘many, a lot of or lots of’, and *para* or *kaum* refer to collective meaning (Alwi et al., 2003) and are placed, as in English, before nouns.

Sundanese has a rather complex morphology for quantification, including infixes and suffixes as well as reduplication; and the whole system is optional (Robins, 1959). It probably depends on some pragmatic source. For example, the plural form of *budak* ‘child’ is *barudak* ‘children’; *tangkal* ‘tree’ is *tatangkalan* ‘trees’; *batur* ‘friend’ is *babaturan* ‘friends’.
Grammatical expression of plurality in English is marked on nouns like Indonesian and Sundanese. English has a singular and plural, which refer to “correspondences of meaning and form” (Corbett, 2000, p. 4). The plural in English is obligatorily marked on most countable nouns by adding the suffix -s such as *cats, dogs, and watches* (Ettlinger & Zapf, 2011). Noun phrases in English usually begin with a determiner such as an article (*a* or *the*), a demonstrative (*this* or *that*) or a quantifier (*some, all, many, few, a lot of*, etc.) following an adjective and a noun (Kroeger, 2005). The agreement is obligatory within a noun phrase (NP) in English when a quantifier appears with a countable noun; in which case the plural -s morpheme occurs on the head noun within the NP as in (12), that is the plural value of the grammatical [number] feature of the noun head and the quantifier must be compatible.

(12) a lot of 
 quantifier red roses 
 adj noun (head)

In conclusion, plurality is optionally marked in Indonesian and Sundanese, whereas in English is obligatorily marked as summarised in Table 1. For Indonesian kindergarten children, learning the English plural marking is a morpho-phonological challenge as well as a lexico-grammatical challenge because of its association with countability. They also need to learn that plurality must be unified within the phrase as in (12) where both the quantifier (*a lot of*) and the noun (*roses*) share the plural feature.
Table 1. Plurality in Indonesian, Sundanese, and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural form</th>
<th>Indonesian</th>
<th>Sundanese</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical plural</td>
<td>Optional (e.g., various forms of reduplication: rumah-rumah ‘houses’)</td>
<td>Optional (e.g., infix -ar- : barudak ‘children’; combination of reduplication and suffix -an: babaturan ‘friends’)</td>
<td>Obligatory in most countable noun (e.g., dogs, roses). Determiner + Adj + Noun (e.g., a red apple)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasal plural</td>
<td>Optional: Numeral/quantitative specifier + Noun (e.g., dua anjing ‘two dogs’)</td>
<td>Optional: Numeral/quantitative specifier + Noun (e.g., tili buku ‘three books’)</td>
<td>Obligatory: If NP has a plural quantifier, the noun must ‘agree’ by marking plurality. Quantifier +(Adj)+ Noun (e.g., two red apples, a lot of red apples)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 English as a global language

This section reviews the theoretical and literature background of learning English as a global language in the Indonesian context. It establishes the relationship between the notion of capital, globalisation, and cosmopolitanism in learning English from sociological perspectives of education.

2.4.1 Bourdieu’s forms of capital

The English program in the early years in Indonesia aims to build children’s linguistic capital. Capital, as conceptualised by French sociologist Bourdieu, is “a species of power whose possession commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 97). There are three principal guises of capital according to Bourdieu (1986): economic capital, which deals with money and the form of property rights; cultural capital refers to the experience and knowledge in
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the form of educational qualifications; and social capital, which relates to social obligations or a network of connections (Bourdieu, 1991).

Linguistic capital is a form of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1991). The word ‘capital’ in the concept of linguistic capital refers to ‘market’, which is adopted from economic terms (Bourdieu, 1991; Grenfell et al., 1998; Silver, 2005). Bourdieu (1991) states, “the constitution of a linguistic market creates the conditions for an objective competition in and through which the legitimate competence can function as linguistic capital, producing a profit of distinction on the occasion of each social exchange” (p. 55). Even though English has no official status in Indonesia, English is still considered to be linguistic capital for parents who are aware of the importance of English as a global language.

Linguistic capital depends on the linguistic competency of the learner, i.e., the ability to use a language (Bourdieu, 1991). This means that if learners have insufficient competency, they may have fewer opportunities regarding social class and mobility (Bourdieu, 1991). In possessing linguistic capital, learners may acquire social capital to achieve social status and acknowledgement (Bourdieu, 1986, 1991). The early English learning program in Indonesian kindergartens recognises this potential. Similarly, parents recognise it as an opportunity to prepare their children to participate in a global world.

2.4.2 Globalisation of English

In the early 2000s, English was used by 1.5 billion people around the world who were fluent and proficient in the language (Crystal, 2003). This makes English the ‘lingua franca’ or common language for international communication, academic purposes, and business communities (Crystal, 2003; Zein, 2019).
The global status of English as a *lingua franca* is evident in Southeast Asia. English has become the official working language of the Association of the Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), which has 10 members, namely Brunei Darussalam, The Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and Myanmar (Kirkpatrick, 2008, 2010; Zein, 2019). The adoption of English in ASEAN member states as the sole working language (Kirkpatrick, 2010) represents the language of modernisation (May, 2012). Interestingly, in cosmopolitan cities like Jakarta, English has become “the second language of the educated urban elite” (Kirkpatrick, 2010, p. 10). Therefore, for Indonesians, being able to communicate in English is inevitable (Zein, 2019).

Acknowledging English as the international *lingua franca*, schools in Indonesia are offering English programs as early as possible to prepare upcoming generations of Indonesian children to function effectively in a globalised world. Here, the concept of globalisation refers to “the spread of transplanetary – and in recent times more particularly supraterritorial – connections between people” (Scholte, 2002, pp. 13-14). From this point of view, Scholte (2002) states that globalisation may reduce the constraint of transworld contacts and people can “physically, legally, culturally, and psychologically engage with each other in one world” (p. 14). English-speaking peoples/countries are not the only ones to be cosmopolitan. In fact, Greek scholars discussed this first, but also Middle Eastern countries were cosmopolitan, including those who were Islamic, although these histories do change.
2.4.3 Cosmopolitanism

The concept of cosmopolitanism in the field of sociology has many interpretations (Beck, 2006; Beck & Sznaider, 2006; Delanty, 2006). Beck (2006) proposes cosmopolitanism is a “multidimensional process, which has irreversibly changed the historical ‘nature’ of social worlds and the standing of states in this world” (p. 12). For Delanty (2006), cosmopolitanism is “a cultural medium of societal transformation that is based on the principle of world openness, which is associated with the notion of global publics” (p. 27). Thus, cosmopolitanism can be applied at every level of social life and political activity (Beck & Sznaider, 2006). According to Bourdieu (1986) and Weenink (2007), cosmopolitanism is also a strength resource that can be manifested as a form of social and cultural capital that is cosmopolitan capital.

The notion of cosmopolitanism can arise in the parents’ view as in Weenink’s empirical study. Weenink (2008) found that parents whose children attended international secondary school in The Netherlands perceived cosmopolitanism as the future of their children. Weenink (2008) proposed cosmopolitan capital as “a propensity to engage in globalising social arenas” (p. 1092). Weenink (2008) found that there were two types of parents from the interview data: dedicated and pragmatic cosmopolitan. Dedicated cosmopolitans were the parents who integrated the world in their perspectives on their children’s life. Pragmatic cosmopolitans were the parents who emphasised the benefit of an international stream for the future career of their children. Thus, identifying parental views on early English L2 program may explain motivation for learning English and perhaps provide valuable information relating to successful English acquisition in the early ages due to the effort parents put into providing a context that is rich in English language opportunities.
2.4.4 Informal English language learning

In Indonesia, language learners, including children, also can further their knowledge of English outside of school through informal English learning. Indeed, observing the informal learning of English is important because children might receive English exposure from television, YouTube, games, and/or from relatives who speak English. Such informal opportunities for learning English are related to sponsors of literacy.

Brandt’s (1998) concept of sponsors of literacy relates to “agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold literacy-and gain advantage by it in some way” (p. 166). Thus, sponsors are figures who support learners in terms of literacy.

Hillerich (1976) defines literacy based on educational and sociological points of view as a “demonstrated competence in communication skills, which enables the individual to function, appropriate to his/her age, independently in his/her society and with a potential for movement in that society” (p. 53). This definition explains how children gain recognition as being ‘literate’ (Hillerich, 1976).

The notion of literacy in the present time has extended beyond the ability to read and write (Djonov, Torr and Stenglin, 2018). According to UNESCO Education Sector (2004, p. 13), the definition of literacy is “the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate and compute, using printed and written materials associated with varying contexts.” This definition attempts to cover various circumstances of literacy, which “involves a continuum of learning in enabling individuals to achieve their goals, to develop their knowledge and potential, and to participate fully in their community and wider society” (UNESCO Education Sector, 2004, p. 13).

In the context of teaching English learning in kindergarten, principals and teachers act as literacy sponsors. In the context of outside school, families, relatives,
and friends may act as literacy sponsors. Both play important roles in the literacy development of children. Therefore, both sponsors could be synergised to support and assist children to access material supply and explicit teaching in literacy learning (Brandt, 1998).

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter provides the language background for this study that relates specifically to English language teaching and learning for early childhood in Indonesia. It begins with the description of language used in Indonesia consisting of the national, vernaculars, and foreign languages. It is followed by an overview of English education policy in Indonesia that places English as an obligatory subject from secondary school to university level. The government also allows primary schools to teach English as an optional subject. However, in metropolitan cities such as Bandung, many kindergartens offer English programs with no detailed linguistic modules in the syllabus. The linguistic context of the participants – involving Sundanese as the local language and Indonesian as the national language – makes learning English at an early age, particularly the concept of plural, challenging. This chapter also reviews theories in the sociology of education relating to the importance of learning English as a global language such as Bourdieu’s linguistic capital, the term cosmopolitan, and the sponsors of literacy. This leads to the following chapter, which reviews the theoretical and literature background of early second language research and teaching methods, particularly in the acquisition of English plural.
CHAPTER 3. THEORETICAL AND LITERATURE BACKGROUND

The previous chapter describes the background context of this study, including the status and function of English in Indonesia; the linguistic characteristics of Indonesian and Sundanese as well as English as a target language (TL); formal and informal English language learning in Indonesia. This chapter presents the theory, approaches and application of SLA to teaching methods, as well as the literature background of this study. This chapter is organised as follows.

Section 3.1 reviews the early research and teaching methods in SLA. Section 3.2 reviews the interactionist approach in SLA. Then, Section 3.3 presents the Processability Theory (PT) as the theoretical framework of this study. This section also includes an overview of Levelt’s speech model (1989) and Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) by Bresnan (2001). Following this, Section 3.4 details DM FonF as the instructional approach of this study and teachers’ linguistic feedback. Section 3.5 examines the wider literature on the acquisition of ESL, the acquisition of plurality in English L2, studies of Indonesian children learning English L2 and studies based on PT. Section 3.6 identifies the research gap and presents the questions as well as hypothesis of this study. Section 3.7 summarises this chapter.
3.1 Early SLA research and teaching methods

This current study investigates the effects of instructed second language acquisition, which is influenced by the Processability Theory and Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form; its application to language teaching. The language learning theories have largely influenced language teaching methods that prevailed at the time. Therefore, this section reviews early research, theoretical approaches, and the application of teaching methods in SLA emergence from the 1950s to the 1980s before the emergence of Processability Theory. Therefore, this section reviews the main theories and related teaching methods to appreciate the current study.

3.1.1 Contrastive Analysis and Audiolingual teaching method

Contrastive Analysis

In the early research on SLA during the 1950s and 1960s, researchers were keen to understand language teaching and learning by comparing the similarities and differences between first language (L1) and a second language (L2) or target language (TL) (Lado, 1957). This was strongly influenced by behaviourist psychology and structural linguistics. The dominant learning theory at the time was Skinner’s (1957) behaviourist theory of psychology. According to behaviourist theory, learning occurs through a process of habit formation and depends on the environment stimuli. Skinner (1957) believed that language learning is like other types of human learning. In terms of language learning, L2 acquisition requires learners to be continuously exposed to correct models so they can imitate them and thereby learn a set of new habits (Lado, 1957). Around the same period behaviourist theory was proposed, structural linguistics provided detailed linguistic description of languages from a collection of utterances produced by the native speakers of the language (Lado, 1957). Structural linguists’
descriptions of different languages are useful to analyse the differences between the
language learner’s first language (L1) and the second language (L2).

Based on the idea of behaviourist psychology and structural linguistics, Lado
(1957) proposes a contrastive analysis (CA) hypothesis, which assumes:

The student who encounters a foreign language will find some features of it
quite easy and others extremely difficult. Those elements that are like his
native language will be simple for him, and those elements that are different
will be difficult. (Lado, p. 2)

This means that the acquisition of a new language would be much easier when there
are many similarities to the L1, however, it would be difficult to acquire where there
are many differences to the L1. In behaviourist psychology, L1 learning is understood
as the formation of a set of habits (imitation, reinforcement, and reward). Lado (1957)
viewed L2 learning as the process of overcoming the habits of the native language to
acquire the new habits of the target language. Therefore, it is important to know the
differences between L1 and L2 systems.

**Audiolingual teaching method**

According to CA proponents (Fries, 1945; Lado, 1957; Banathy, Trager & Waddle,
1966), in learning and teaching an L2, the teacher may contrast the system of L1, e.g.,
the phonology, semantics and syntax, with the system of L2 to identify difficulties that
L2 learners will face (Wardhaugh, 1970). In the CA, when errors emerged in the L2
learning, they were often associated with interference from the L1 (Lado, 1957).
However, in L2, learners need to understand the deep and surface structure of the
second language as it is (Wardhaugh, 1970). Therefore, Wardhaugh (1970) argues that
using CA in the learning task of second language has little to no significant effect
because the rules around internalising any languages are unique. Towell and Hawkins
(1994) also state that CA cannot predict the learning difficulties in L2. This learning theory leads to the development of the Audiolingual language teaching method (ALM), which provides a linguistic syllabus containing phonology, morphology, and syntax by using dialogues for memorisation and drills for repetition (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). ALM is a grammar-centred, inductive way of language teaching where learners are expected to discover grammatical regulations of the target language from many examples, pattern practice, and drills without explanation from the teacher (c.f., Richards & Rodgers, 2001). However, the teacher plays a significant role in controlling and correcting the learners’ performance by not allowing them to make errors when they produce the language (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

In summary, Behaviourist theory contributes to L2 learning and teaching to predict troublesome areas in L2 learning, which can prevent errors or reduce them to a minimum. The theory also contributes to the development of a specific teaching method, ALM, based on reinforcement and reward for overcoming L1 habits and changing them to new L2-patterns.

3.1.2 Morpheme Studies, Monitor Theory and Natural Approach in teaching

During the 1960s and 1970s, two seminal publications in the field of SLA were published. The research of Corder (1967) and Selinker (1972) informed the modern study of SLA. In 1967, Corder (1967) proposed an Error Analysis (EA) approach. He argues that we cannot deny that L1 influences on L2 (especially phonological features) but that not all L2 errors are due to L1 transfer, as Behaviourist theory proposes. Corder (1967), instead, suggests learners follow a universal route in acquiring L2, which is not influenced by their L1. This idea was inspired by Chomsky’s (1959, 1965) Innatist view of L1 learning where L1 learning is not a product of habit formation, but rather
one of rule formation. The child can both comprehend and produce utterances he/she has never heard before, which means the child is not merely imitating, as Behaviourism assumes.

Corder (1967) claims L2 learners use some of the same strategies children use in learning their L1. He points out that errors made by L2 learners should not be treated as incompetence in L2, but as positive evidence that L2 learners are in the process of acquiring the L2 linguistic system (Corder, 1967). The EA theory is also supported by L1 acquisition studies (e.g., Brown, 1973), which found that children make ‘developmental’ errors created by their internalised rules.

Selinker (1972) coined the term, ‘interlanguage’ and claims L2 learners have an individual linguistic system that is self-governed in both L1 and L2. The interlanguage refers to the linguistic system of the target language (TL) that L2 learners try to produce, which is manifested by their “observable output” (Selinker, 1972, p. 214). He also believes that interlanguage shows evidence of so-called “fossilisation” (Selinker, 1972). Fossilisation is a process that is thought to occur in the latent psychological structure (Selinker, 1972). Selinker’s notion of fossilisation relates to linguistic structures, which consist of phonological, morphological and syntactical features and rules in the speakers of L1 that are stored in their interlanguage even though they have received greater exposure and instruction in the TL (Selinker, 1972).

**Morpheme studies and Monitor Theory**

Morpheme studies originated in child language (L1) acquisition (Brown, 1973) and exhibit a non-behaviourist view of language acquisition. Brown’s (1973) seminal longitudinal study of English L1 acquisition identifies common language developmental stages, particularly in semantic and syntax. Brown (1973) investigates
14 English grammatical morphemes among three children and finds that all three children began to learn them at the same age, and in much the same way.

Dulay and Burt (1973, 1974a) apply the findings from Brown’s study to L2 acquisition research and conduct morpheme studies to investigate the accurate order of English morphemes in SLA. Dulay and Burt (1973) conduct the first study about the order of acquisition of eight English grammatical morphemes on the speech production of 151 Spanish L1 children aged five to eight-years-old who learned English L2 in the United States. The children’s speech data were collected using the bilingual syntax measures (BSM) i.e., a tool for measuring the acquisition of grammatical structures of English and/or Spanish in an L2 setting. Dulay and Burt (1973) found that the order of acquisition of English grammatical morphemes was similar among Spanish L1 children, but it was different from Brown’s (1973) English L1 acquisition study. This finding led to the second study about the order of acquisition of 11 English grammatical morphemes of 60 Spanish L1 and 55 Chinese L1 children who learned English L2 (Dulay & Burt, 1974a). They found that the acquisition of 11 English grammatical morphemes of both Spanish and Chinese L1 children in the natural setting followed the similar order. The findings provide evidence that children are creative in constructing the linguistic system of L2 that is guided by a universal, innate mechanism for the acquisition process (Dulay & Burt, 197a).

Furthermore, Bailey, Madden and Krashen (1974) examine relative accuracy order of these morphemes among adult L2 learners English from various L1 backgrounds. Their main finding is a fixed accuracy order of L2 English morphemes regardless of learners’ age and L1.

While the three earlier morpheme studies were conducted cross-sectionally, Hakuta (1974, 1976, 1978) conducted the acquisition of English grammatical
morphemes longitudinally. Hakuta explored the learning of English L2 in natural setting over 60 weeks in a five-year-old Japanese girl (Ugisu) in the United States. He found that the acquisition order of English grammatical morphemes was different from the earlier morpheme studies.

Following, Table 2 summarises the acquisition order of English plural -s in three cross-sectional morpheme studies (Dulay and Burt, 1973, 1974a; Bailey, et.al., 1974) and Hakuta's (1976) longitudinal study, which are relevant to the present study. The number in the table signifies the rank order of acquisition of English grammatical morphemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morpheme studies</th>
<th>Rank (plural -s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dulay and Burt (1973)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulay and Burt (1974a)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, Madden and Krashen (1974)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakuta (1976)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the acquisition of plural -s, Dulay and Burt (1973) rank first among other morpheme studies. In other studies, Dulay and Burt (1974a) and Bailey, et.al. (1974) found that plural -s ranked as a second order. Hakuta (1976) found that plural -s was acquired the last among other morpheme studies.

Morpheme studies identify the existence of developmental order. To explain the natural developmental order, Krashen (1978) proposes the Monitor Theory, which contains five main hypotheses, namely the acquisition-learning hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, the natural order hypothesis, the input hypothesis, and the affective filter hypothesis (Krashen, 1981). These five hypotheses are outlined below.
In the acquisition-learning hypothesis, Krashen differentiates between acquisition and learning in developing competence in an L2 (1982). Acquisition is a subconscious process like the process of children acquiring their L1 (Krashen, 1982). In contrast, learning is a conscious process of gaining knowledge of the grammatical rules and patterns of the TL (Krashen, 1982; VanPatten & Williams, 2007). Krashen emphasises the distinction between the language environments in language acquisition and learning. Acquisition takes place in the naturalistic environment (as in children’s L1 acquisition), whereas learning takes place in the classroom environment. This hypothesis indicates that there is no interface between acquisition and learning, which means teaching explicit grammatical knowledge in classroom does not lead to “learning”. The detailed explanation of this issue is presented in Section 3.2 Instructed SLA.

The monitor hypothesis claims that learners have a ‘monitor’ and this explains SL performance, which may depend on both “the acquired system” and “the learned system”. The acquired system initiates utterances in an L2 and the learned system plays the roles of the monitor in planning, editing and correcting speech production. The monitor system works when three circumstances are met: having enough time for speech production, focusing on the form, not on its meaning and knowing the appropriate rule (Krashen, 1982). Thus, L2 teaching should promote the optimal use of the monitor.

The natural order hypothesis states “the acquisition of grammatical structures proceeds in a predictable order” (Krashen, 1982, p. 12), and the order of acquisition is not determined solely by linguistic complexity nor the order of instruction; instead, it is a manifestation of the acquired system (Krashen, 1982). This means that explicit teaching in the classroom does not change the natural developmental order.
The input hypothesis explains how learners acquire languages. According to Krashen (1982), when the learner’s current level of competence is at ‘stage $i$’, he/she can move to the next stage by understanding input containing ‘$i+1$’. This hypothesis sets the comprehensible input for learners in acquiring an L2, and consequently, comprehensible input is a necessary condition for learners to acquire L2 naturally.

The affective filter hypothesis originally proposed by Dulay and Burt (1977), identifies the three fundamental variables for SLA as motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety. The three attitudinal factors correlate with acquisition and not learning (Krashen, 1982). This means learners with high motivation, good self-confidence and low anxiety tend to attain SLA more readily. This is opposed to learners who do not have the optimal attitudes for SLA who “will not only tend to seek less input, but they will also have a high or strong Affective Filter” (Krashen, 1982, p. 31). Hence, even if learners understand the message, the input will not reach the part of the brain, which is responsible for language acquisition or the language acquisition device (Krashen, 1982).

Krashen’s Monitor theory has received much criticism from linguists and researchers. McLaughlin (1978) argues that the acquisition-learning distinction is not reliable because there are no psychological criteria existing to measure the distinction and the hypothesis cannot be tested empirically. Morrison and Low (1983) also criticise Krashen’s Monitor theory because the syntax of the production of utterances and monitor could not explain the comprehension. Further, Gregg (1988), Pienemann and Johnston (1987) argue that the input hypothesis cannot explain the morpheme order that has been found, as well as other developmental sequences. Thus, the Monitor theory seems not to be able to measure the L2 development.
**Natural Approach in teaching**

As reviewed above, Morpheme Studies and Monitor Theory claim language development is a creative process that may not be influenced solely by the learner’s L1 but that there is a natural developmental path. Influenced by these early SLA theories, Terrel collaborated with Krashen to develop the theoretical aspects of language teaching that integrate naturalistic principles in L2 acquisition and proposed *The Natural Approach*. Krashen and Terrel (1983) classify the natural approach as “traditional” approaches of language teaching, i.e., the use of language in communicative situations without using the native language and without teaching grammar. The natural approach focuses on natural language development and emphasises exposure to input, i+1, for the learner to attain the next stage (Krashen & Terrel, 1983). With this approach, it is taboo for the teacher to force the learner to produce the utterances when they are not ‘ready’ because this would increase the learner’s ‘affective filter’ (i.e., anxiety). So, the learner’s ‘readiness’ is a keyword of the approach. The natural approach became popular in North America (c.f., Richards & Rodgers, 2001) and immersion education programs in language learning in Canada – starting in the mid-1960s, and in North America in the 1970s – are derived from the Natural Approach (c.f., Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

### 3.1.3 Communicative Competence and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Current language education across the world values interaction and communication using the target language (Rollmann, 1994). This subsection reviews communicative language teaching (CLT) and its linguistic background.

Communicative language teaching (CLT) originated in Britain during the late 1960s. According to the background of CLT, significant linguistic theoretical changes
occur after structural linguistics. An American linguist, Chomsky (1957) criticises the behaviourist and structuralist point of view of linguistics. Chomsky observes that structural theories of language are not able to account for the basic characteristic of language, i.e., the creativity and uniqueness of individual sentences (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Therefore, Chomsky proposes two fundamental concepts, i.e., competence and performance. Competence refers to “the speaker-hearer’s knowledge of his language”, whereas performance refers to “the actual use of language in concrete situations” (Chomsky, 1965, p. 4). For Chomsky (1965), the study of linguistics aims to find out “underlying linguistic competence” – the rules that inform the production of grammatical sentences. Thus, Chomsky dismisses the importance of linguistic performance. Hymes (1971) responds to Chomsky’s characterisation of the linguistic competence of the standard native speaker and proposes the term communicative competence to include knowledge of sociolinguistics, i.e., the use of language in social context. Referring to Hymes (1972), Litosseliti (2010) emphasises the significance of communicative competence by stating that a person who has only linguistic competence would be quite unable to communicate.

In terms of language education, language teaching tradition changes from the mastery of structures to situational language teaching where “language is taught by practising basic structures in meaningful situation-based activities” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 153). However, British applied linguists question the theoretical assumptions of situational language teaching. Influenced by Hymes’ concept of communicative competence, they propose a new approach to language teaching; Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which focuses on communicative proficiency rather than on mastery of grammatical structures (e.g., John Firth and M.A.K Halliday) (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). British and European communities’
political and financial interdependence at the time also created a demand for the speaker’s high communicative competence across languages. For these reasons, many linguists thought that Situational language teaching and Audiolingualism were no longer appropriate as teaching methodologies (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). This was because both Situational language teaching and Audiolingualism focus on oral practice, grammar, and sentence patterns of the target language.

CLT strives to develop the communicative competence of learners, which focuses on the proper use of language in the real situation (Hymes, 1972). At the same time, another American linguist, Savignon (1972) used the same term, communicative competence, to categorise the capability of language learners in interacting with other speakers in order to make meaning.

Communicative language teaching (CLT) is a method of teaching a second and a foreign language, which emphasises interaction as the goal of language learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The principles of CLT as an approach include: learners learn a language to communicate; the purpose of classroom activities should be accurate and meaningful communication; fluency is a significant aspect in communication; the integration of different language skills should be involved in communication; and learning is a process of creative thinking, which involves trial and error (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Nowadays, CLT is still widely used as a teaching approach and method (Richards & Rodgers, 2001), including in Indonesian kindergarten in this present study.

In summary, this subsection reviews earlier SLA theories and the main teaching methods influenced by the significant linguistic theories at the period. Focus of language learning moved from grammatical competence to communicative competence over the period.
3.2 **Instructed SLA: Interactionist Approach and Focus on Form**

The issue of natural or instructed L2 acquisition in the classroom context has been debated in SLA. Some experts believe natural acquisition is a useful and effective way to learn the language (Krashen, Terrel, Ehrman, & Herzog, 1984). Others argue that instructed acquisition positively affects second language learning (Long & Robinson, 1998; Ellis, 2005). To answer this issue, empirical research on instructed SLA has become vital in recent years to examine the effect of different instructed settings of SLA. This section reviews this issue, focusing on the Interactionist Approach to SLA and Focus on Form language teaching method.

Natural language acquisition occurs both outside, and inside the classroom context. According to Monitor Theory (Krashen, et al., 1984), children acquire language when they receive comprehensible input. Therefore, comprehensible input is a necessary condition for learners to acquire L2 through understanding the message (Krashen, 1982). However, according to Gass, Behney and Plonsky (2013), learning another language in a foreign language setting allows only for limited input. In such a learning setting, learners receive the input in classroom, generally only from the teacher, other learners and learning materials (Gass et al., 2013) and it may be difficult to obtain language input outside the classroom. For example, in Indonesia, where English is mostly a foreign language, the opportunities to interact with native speakers of English in the natural setting are severely restricted. To maximise learning condition as well as learning outcome, ‘instructed’ second language learning becomes important (Long, 1987; Ellis, 2005). Ellis (2005) defines that instruction is a process of intervention in language learning. There are two types of intervention i.e., direct, and indirect interventions. In direct intervention, learners receive the instruction on what
they learn; in indirect intervention, learners receive the instruction about *how* to communicate in the L2.

**Interactionist approach**

In recent years, the interactionist approach of language acquisition has impacted the classroom, instructed SLA. Issues surrounding instructed SLA, including its central concepts, practical applications to classroom instruction, and empirical studies to measure its efficacy are reviewed below.

The interactionist view is originally based on Vygotsky’s socio-cultural theory (Muho & Kurani, 2014), where he states, “social interaction plays an important role in the learning process and proposes the zone of proximal development (ZPD), where learners construct the new language through socially mediated interaction” (Brown, 2007, p. 287). Some linguists (Hatch, 1978; Long, 1983, 1996; Pica, 1994; Gass, 1997) claim that conversational interaction plays an important role in SLA. Long (1996) proposes the interactionist approach of SLA, identifying input, interaction, and output as the three important elements in the interaction approach. Long (1996) claims that interaction is an important component for the learner to acquire a target language. Interactionist supporters conducted research using the Interaction Hypothesis, which emphasises cognitive factors such as noticing and corrective feedback during interactions (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Interaction hypothesis states that L2 learning is encouraged by conversational interaction because learners receive comprehensible input and feedback from their interlocutor and they also have the chance to generate modified output (Gass 1997, 2005; Long, 1996; Pica 1994; Swain, 2005; Sato & Ballinger, 2016).

Interaction involves input and output. Input is “the linguistic forms used; by interaction is meant the functions served by those forms, such as expansion, repetition
and clarification” (Long, 1981, p. 259). Interaction happens when learners participate in conversations and they receive information (input) about the correctness and incorrectness of their own utterances (Gass & Mackey, 2007).

Output is the language that learners produce (Long, 1996). Swain (1985, 1995, 2000), based on observations about the significance of output in a French immersion program in Canada, proposes the Output Hypothesis, which explains the relationship between language use and language learning. Swain notes children who had six or seven years of comprehensible input in the French immersion program still had a level of competence in the L2 that was far from native-like abilities (Swain, 2000; Gass & Mackey, 2007). Swain (2000) argue this might be due to insufficient amount of output by the students and emphasises “the importance of output to learning could be that output pushes learners to process language more deeply – with more mental effort – than does input” (p. 99). This means that language production pushes learners to move from comprehension (semantic) to syntactic use of language (Gass & Mackey, 2007). Thus, L2 production (i.e., output) forces learners to undertake complete grammatical processing, and thus, drives the development of L2 grammar.

Output may also promote ‘noticing’ a language form that must occur for it to be acquired (Ellis, Tanaka, & Yamazaki, 1994). Noticing refers to private learners’ experience when they are aware of a particular language feature in the input (Schmidt, 1990). Schmidt’s (1990) noticing hypothesis suggests that acquisition of particular language form is possible only when it has been ‘noticed’.

Focus on Form

There is a natural language development order and instructed SLA cannot alter this order (e.g., Pienemann, 1984). However, the classroom instruction of language learning can speed up the learning process, increase grammatical accuracy, and
promote high communicative competence. Language teaching focusing solely on grammar without context does not promote communicative competence, while teaching focusing solely on meaning-based communication tends not to promote grammatical accuracy and the use of linguistically complex structures (e.g., Pavesi, 1984). The interactionist approach suggests that effective instructed SLA should have the right balance of form and meaning and attract learners’ attention to the form while processing its meaning. The teaching method proposed for this purpose is known as Focus on Form (Long 1991), which claims to promote second language acquisition most effectively.

To appreciate Focus on Form, the differences between Focus on Forms (FonFs), Focus on Form (FonF), and Focus on meaning need to be understood. Long and Robinson (1998) summarise the categories of the three options in language teaching, Option 1 Focus on FormS, Option 2 focus on meaning, and Option 3 focus on form, in Table 3 below.
Table 3. Options in language teaching *(adapted from Long & Robinson, 1998, p. 16)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>analytic</td>
<td>analytic</td>
<td>synthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on meaning</td>
<td>focus on form</td>
<td>focus on formS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural approach</td>
<td>Task-based language teaching (TBLT)</td>
<td>Grammar Translation, Audiolinguual method, Silent Way, Total Physical Response (TPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>Content-based language Teaching (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural syllabus</td>
<td>Process syllabus (?) etc</td>
<td>Structural/Notational Syllabuses etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 1 is FonFs, which is based on the language teaching syllabus focusing on specific grammatical structures, where the learner learns independent grammatical components one by one. Therefore, with FonFs, the learner must integrate all these components to achieve communicative competence. FonFs is a synthetic approach based on Wilkin’s (1976) term, i.e., “parts of language are taught separately and step-by-step so that acquisition is a process of gradual accumulation of the parts until the whole structure of the language has been built up” (p. 2). Synthetic syllabi include corresponding materials, methodology and classroom pedagogy, which lead to Focus on FormS (FonFs) lessons (Long & Robinson, 1998). FonFs approach focuses on discrete lexical, grammatical, notional-functional items in non-communicative and non-authentic language tasks (Long & Robinson, 1998; Laufer, 2006). The synthetic methods of language teaching comprise of grammar translation, audiolinguual method, silent way, total physical response, etc. Focus on FormS approach includes grammar translation teaching method and audiolinguual method.

The second option, Focus on Meaning, is an analytic approach where the language teaching syllabi are “organised in terms of the purposes for which people are
learning language and the kinds of language performance that are necessary to meet those purposes” (Wilkins, 1976, p. 13). This means that the syllabi are not focused on the grammatical structures but on the language behaviour. With Option 2, L2 learning samples can be modified in various ways that should be comprehensible for the learner and ‘natural’, which leads to Focus on Meaning lessons (Long & Robinson, 1998). Focus on meaning approach includes Prabhu’s procedural syllabus, Krashen and Terrel’s Natural approach, and immersion education (Long & Robinson, 1998).

The third option of language teaching, FonF, involves a focus on linguistic features, while meaning-based learning activities are carried out. According to Long (1991), focus on form (FonF) is an instructional approach which “... overtly draws attention to the linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication” (pp. 45-46). So, for Long the incidental nature is central to FonF and it refers exclusively to feedback rather than the instructional program per se. For example, teachers can select or offer the linguistic forms that will be focused on in a lesson and need to pay attention to the form in the lesson by giving feedback to the learners. Therefore, the corrective or negative feedback is the procedure of FonF.

As can be seen in Table 3, Option 3, FonF, is situated in-between grammar focused Option 1 (Focus on FormS), and communication focused Option 2 (Focus on Meaning). FonF seeks both form (accuracy) and meaning (fluency) since the goal of FonF is acquiring high and accurate communicative competence (Doughty, 1998). FonF is an analytic approach focusing on task as a non-linguistic unit of analysis. Syllabus content of FonF includes pedagogical tasks focusing on content rather than specific linguistic focus (Long & Crookes, 1992; Long & Robinson, 1998).
A crucial component of Focus on Form is interaction, including negotiation of meaning and feedback. Long states that “negotiation of meaning, and especially negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the native speaker (NS) or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways” (1996, pp. 451-452). This means that negotiated interaction creates opportunities for learners to focus on form. The interaction may also attract learners’ attention to something new, such as new vocabulary items, grammatical and syntactic structures through negotiation of meaning, corrective feedback, etc. The following reviews FonF techniques of Corrective Feedback (CF). It is important to look at the language environment through the teacher-learner interaction, especially the feedback from the teacher.

In terms of FonF techniques, Long (1996) defines CF according to two categories. The first category is explicit CF, i.e., an overt correction and metalinguistic explanation given to the learner about his/her erroneous output. The second category is implicit CF, further divided into two categories, recast and negotiation of meaning (NoM). Recast refers to corrective reformulations of the learner’s incorrect utterance while preserving all other parts of utterance (Long & Robinson, 1998). NoM is the strategy used by the teacher and learners when communication problems occur and this strategy is used until successful communication is achieved (Long & Robinson, 1998; Kawaguchi & Ma, 2012). Oliver (1995) points out that the strategies for NoM include clarification requests, confirmation checks, comprehension checks and repetition as in Figure 1 below.
In summary, the interaction between teacher and learner, learner and learner, and corrective feedback are the key factors of FonF as an instructional approach. Instructed L2 learning is especially important in a country with limited input of a target language, such as English education in Indonesia. In the next section, an overview of Processability Theory (PT) as a theoretical framework of this present study is presented.

### 3.3 Processability Theory as a framework of language development

This section first summarises the precursor theories of PT as a theoretical framework of this study. Pienemann (2005b) summarises PT and its predecessors as the development of PT in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Key references</th>
<th>Key concepts</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional Model</td>
<td>Meisel, Clahsen &amp; Pienemann, 1981; Pienemann, Johnston &amp; Meisel, 1993</td>
<td>- implicational scaling, - probabilistic rules, - emergence criterion, - two dimensions in L2 dynamics: (1) development (2) variation</td>
<td>descriptive framework for dynamic processes in L2 development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies Approach</td>
<td>Clahsen, 1984</td>
<td>development of L2 German word order</td>
<td>explanation of German L2 word order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 PT and its predecessors and relatives (after Pienemann, 2005b, p. 72)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachability Hypothesis</th>
<th>Pienemann, 1984, 1989</th>
<th>stages of acquisition cannot be skipped through instruction, variation can be altered, speed can be accelerated</th>
<th>explains constraints on teachability, originally German L2 word order development, based on strategies, universal since based on PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictive Framework</td>
<td>Pienemann &amp; Johnston, 1987</td>
<td>development of ESL morphi-syntax determined by incremental development of processing resources</td>
<td>explain developmental patterns in ESL and GSL morphi-syntax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Pienemann (2005b), there are some limitations in the predecessors of PT. For example, the Multidimensional Model (MDM) (Meisel, et al., 1981; Pienemann, et al, 1993) received some criticism from Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991). First, the MDM reveals constraints on acquisition without explaining the learning process of L2 learners. Second, it lacks clarity in identifying variational interlanguage features *a priori*. Lastly, the falsifiability of the predictive framework arises as a problem from some vagueness on violations of the processing constraints amid common developmental features.

The Predictive Framework (Pienemann & Johnston, 1987) was based on transformational assumptions in the order of acquisitional stages which lacked
typological or psychological plausibility (Pienemann, 2015). Therefore, Pienemann (1998) strives to overcome the limitations of predecessors by integrating Levelt’s (1989) speech processing model and Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) (Bresnan, 2001; Dalrymple, 2001; Falk, 2001) as a theory of grammar which is typologically and psychologically plausible.

Processability Theory (PT) (Pienemann, 1998) is a theory that can predict the developmental trajectories in morphology and syntax of any second languages (Pienemann, 1998; Di Biase, Kawaguchi, & Yamaguchi, 2015). PT hypothesises a general hierarchy of language processing resources, which can be related to the specific procedural skills for L2 acquisition based on the general architecture of human language processing (Pienemann, 2005a).

PT incorporates Levelt’s (1989) psycholinguistic model of the speaker to explain online speech production from “intention to articulation” through the processing steps of conceptualisation, lexical retrieval and grammar formulation, phonological retrieval and finally, articulation. To represent grammatical forms, PT relies on Bresnan’s LFG, that is “a theory of grammar, which has a powerful, flexible, and mathematically well-defined grammar formalism designed for typologically diverse languages” (Bresnan, 2001, p. viii). Thus, PT attempts to provide a typologically and psychologically plausible model of SLA.

Pienemann (1998, 2011b) adopts the hierarchy of grammatical encoding used in Levelt (1989) which is based on Kempen and Hoeknamp (1987) procedural grammar. The sequence of the procedures is as follow:

1. the lemma,

2. the category procedure (lexical category of lemma),
3. the phrasal procedure (instigated by the category of the head),
4. the S (Sentence)-procedure,
5. the subordinate clause procedure.

This hierarchy of processing procedures derives from the fact that each lower level is a prerequisite for the functioning of the next higher level. Pienemann’s intuition is that they would be learned by the L2 learner following the same implicational patterns as represented in Table 5 below. The (+) sign refers to a certain processing procedure having been acquired and the (−) sign refers to the absence of a certain processing procedure at a particular time (t1, t2 and so on) of learning the L2.

Table 5. The implicational sequence of processing procedures
(Source: Pienemann, 1998, p. 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t1</th>
<th>t2</th>
<th>t3</th>
<th>t4</th>
<th>t5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>● Sub-clause procedure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>● S-procedure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>● Phrasal procedure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>● Category procedure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>● Word/lemma access</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 5, a lexical morpheme requires the corresponding diacritic feature, depending on the language being processed, and the category of the word being processed, such as a person, number etc. as part of the verb lemma in English. Phrasal agreement can only occur if phrasal procedures have been assigned, so that the
diacritic and other features of the head can be exchanged with the modifier. For interphrasal agreement such as subject-verb agreement to occur, where this is relevant for the language in question, two preceding processing procedures must be in place. The grammatical functions of the phrase (i.e., whether the specific phrase is a subject, object, or other core element, is identified through Appointment Rules. The S-procedure must be set up to store the pertinent phrasal information needed for the process of agreement, where the language requires it. That is, the hierarchy of processing procedures needs to be interpretable regarding grammatical structures of an individual language so that the hierarchy can be applicable to language acquisition. This process can be obtained by using a theory of grammar such as LFG, which aims at typological and psychological plausibility.

In terms of linguistic knowledge, PT applies LFG, as originally proposed by Kaplan and Bresnan (1982). Later versions of PT (Pienemann et al., 2005; Bettoni & Di Biase 2015) used the later developments of LFG (Bresnan, 2001; Dalrymple, 2001; Falk, 2001). Lexical Functional Grammar is designed as a theory of grammar, which represents linguistic knowledge and cognitive features of language processing (Kaplan & Bresnan 1982; Bresnan 2001) characterise as “a theory of grammar, which has a powerful, flexible, and mathematically well-defined grammar formalism designed for typologically diverse languages” (Bresnan, 2001, p. vii). LFG has been widely applied to descriptive and theoretical frameworks for many languages such as Australian languages (Simpson, 1991 for Warlpiri; Nordlinger, 1998 for Wambaya), African languages (Bresnan & Kanerva, 1989 for Chichewa), Japanese (Ishikawa, 1985; Matsumoto, 1996) and Balinese (Arka, 2003).

Processability Theory applies LFG as it is compatible with Levelt’s (1989) speech model because it assumes that grammars are lexically driven and because of
the status of ‘primitives’ assigned to functional annotations of phrases and the mechanism of feature matching. A key concept of LFG is, which is critical for PT, is its ‘feature unification’ which is compatible with Levelt’s (1989) model.

LFG (Bresnan, 2001) comprises three parallel levels of syntactic structures: a constituent structure (or c-structure), an argument structure (or a-structure) and a functional structure (or f-structure) as shown in Figure 2 below, which shows a simplified of the mapping relations between the three structures for the sentence ‘Peter sees a dog’.

Figure 2. Three parallel structures in LFG
(Source: Pienemann, Di Biase, and Kawaguchi, 2005, p. 200)

The c-structure of a sentence can be represented as a phrase structure tree, which relates to the linear arrangement of words and phrases in that sentence. The c-structure is language specific. The a-structure, on the other hand, contains a predicate and its arguments, which relate to the semantic role(s) (such as Agent, Patient, Theme, and so on) required by the predicate (e.g., a verb). The f-structure level represents the functional information of all the syntactic notions such as Subject (SUBJ), Object (OBJ), Complement and Adjunct and features necessary for the assemblage of the
sentence. The latter two parallel structures (a-structure and f-structure) have universal reflexes across languages. To show the structure a sentence, all three levels should be mapped onto one another as presented in Figure 2 above. The figure shows that the sentence ‘Peter sees a dog’ consists of an Experiencer (Peter) and a Theme (a dog) both of which are arguments of the predicate ‘see’, which requires a ‘seer’ role and a ‘seen’ role. From the functional structure point of view the seer (Peter) is mapped on the grammatical function SUBJ and the seen (a dog) is mapped on theOBJ in the f-structure. The verb ‘sees’ with the affix -s has the subject person (third) and number(singular) features, which must be compatible with feature information in the SUBJ (Peter) (third person, singular). These features unify Noun Phrase (Peter) with the verb (sees). On the other hand, other features of the verb, e.g., TENSE= present and ASPECT= non continuous do not unify because the NP does not share such features (i.e., English Nouns are not marked for tense and aspect).

Figure 3 below represents the notion of feature unification, a central characteristic of LFG, which is critical to PT. Notice that the unification process here involves the SUBJ, and the V. English OBJ does not share features with V, so no unification is involved between OBJ and V.
As shown in Figure 3, the sentence (S procedure) ‘Peter sees a dog’ consists an Experiencer, Peter, with the grammatical function of SUBJ, a Noun Phrase whose lexical features include $\text{NUM(BER)}=\text{SG}$ (singular), $\text{PERS(ON)}=3$ (third). The verb ‘sees’ with the affix -$s$ displays the same feature and value information as the SUBJ, that is $\text{NUM(BER)}=\text{SG}$ (singular), $\text{PERS(ON)}=3$ (third), which must be compatible and so can be unified or merged at the S-node.

In PT, the hierarchy of processability is related to feature unification as follows (Pienemann, 2015, p. 165):

1. no exchange of grammatical information (for category procedure),
2. exchange of grammatical information within the phrase (phrasal procedure),
3. exchange of grammatical information between different phrases (S-procedure),
4. exchange of information between main and subordinate clauses (S-procedure).

The earliest version of PT (Pienemann, 1998) rationalises the developmental hierarchy of processing procedures in syntax and morphology for all languages using
feature unification focusing on c-structure and the transfer of grammatical information within it. In other words, PT is designed to tackle the developmental problem, which does not contain the mechanism of learning (Wiedemann et al., 2005; Pienemann, 2015). Processability Theory has since developed further based on the advancement of LFG (e.g., Bresnan, 2001) to address the logical problem (Pienemann et al., 2005). The current study, however, focuses on the acquisition of early morphology from the lemma to the phrasal procedures for English L2, as described next and makes no use of the newer PT developments, as they concern primarily more advanced learners.

**Processability Hierarchy for English L2**

Pienemann (1998, 2005a, 2011a) proposes a universal hierarchy of stages of morphological development, which must be applied to the specific language type. For the acquisition of plural marking in English L2, development happens over three morphological stages, which are illustrated in Table 6.
Table 6 Developmental stages hypothesised for L2-English morphology (adapted from Plenemann, 2011; Di Biase, et.al, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processing procedure</th>
<th>Information exchange</th>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Phrasal Procedure</em></td>
<td>information exchange within the NP</td>
<td>phrasal plural marking</td>
<td><em>these girls</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>many dogs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>three black cats</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Category Procedure</em></td>
<td>no information exchange</td>
<td>past-ed</td>
<td><em>Mary jumped</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plural -s possessives</td>
<td><em>dogs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verb -ing</td>
<td><em>Mary's car</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>he eating</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Lemma access</em></td>
<td>word no information exchange</td>
<td>single word, formulae</td>
<td><em>apple</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>how are you?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6, the first PT stage is ‘lemma access’, a necessary starting point for all learners that allows for the processing of single words or formulas in the L2. In this stage, the learner builds up various lexical items and fixed expressions such as *apple, how are you?* Words and formulaic expressions are produced in isolation and are retrieved from the mental lexicon not yet annotated for lexical class or other grammatical features.

The second PT stage is the ‘category procedure’. This procedure is language-specific. Within this stage, lexical categories (such as noun, verb) as well as features (e.g., number) and their value (e.g., singular, plural, and so on), are learned. At this stage, learners can add the morpheme -s to nouns to indicate plural number without any exchange of information with other elements in the phrase (e.g., *I like dogs*).

The next in the hierarchy is the ‘phrasal procedure’ stage, in which learners can exchange information between constituents, such as determiners and the head noun,
within the noun phrase. They can produce plural agreement in the NP, for instance, a quantifier and the head noun, as in *many dogs; three black cats.*

In the refinement of PT 2005, Bettoni and Di Biase (2015) proposed ‘extra’ processing barriers within a stage, which they called ‘soft barriers’. This is a sequencing of structures within a stage first pointed out by Mansouri and Håkansson (2007). The term ‘soft barriers' refers to the fact that after overcoming a ‘hard barrier' (i.e., acquiring a stage) the learner may find further barries within that same stage relating to some new lexical feature peculiar to some structure within that stage. For instance, having learned to mark the plural agreement between a noun and a definite numeral quantifier (as in, e.g., *three dogs*) and thus acquiring the Phrasal procedure stage, the learner has to learn to unify the Noun with other sorts of quantifiers. That is, they have to learn to unify also the value of indefinite quantifiers (such as *many, lots of*) within the Noun Phrase (as in, e.g., *many dogs*) which is a structure at the same Phrasal Stage. The skill to produce such agreements are acquired apparently in that sequence, i.e., definite quantifiers first and indefinite quantifiers later as found by e.g., Yamaguchi (2010), Di Biase et al. (2015), and confirmed by Mohammed Salleh et al. (2016).

According to Bettoni and Di Biase (2015), “once the hard barriers across stages have been crossed, language specific soft barriers within that stage can be identified, and attendant hypotheses may be entertained and tested” (p. 75). For example, within phrasal plural agreement in English definite quantifiers seem to occur first and later with indefinite ones (Bettoni & Di Biase, 2015). The following section reviews empirical studies on the acquisition of ESL, which are relevant to the current study.
3.4 Language development studies on the acquisition of English as a second language (ESL)

This section reviews language development studies on the acquisition of ESL relating to this present study. These include the acquisition of grammatical morphemes of English L1 and L2, the acquisition of plurality in English L2 and English L2 development based on PT.

Lexical acquisition is strongly connected to the emergence of grammar in L1 acquisition (Sansavini et. al., 2006). In L1 acquisition, “grammatical ability develops not only as a function of age but also depends crucially on lexical abilities. Indeed, word combinations are usually absent when children still produce less than 100 words and remain infrequent until the vocabulary reaches 300 words” (Sansavini et. al., 2006, p. 200). Referring to L1 research in the same language thereby helps to discover possible similarities in the L2 acquisition process.

Developmental studies of SLA closely follow those in L1 acquisition. Brown (1973), in his seminal longitudinal study of English L1 proposes developmental stages in language acquisition, particularly in sentence construction in both semantic and syntactic terms. He investigates the language development of three preschool children (Adam, Sarah, and Eve), acquiring English as their first language in the natural environment in America over four years. The primary data are the spontaneous speech at home between the children and their mothers (sometimes the fathers and others). Brown observes that the children developed over the same route, but each child developed at their own rhythm. For instance, in the case of plurals, Adam acquires plural marking on nouns at 2;6 (two years and six-months-old), Sarah at 2;10 and Eve at 1;11. Adam and Sarah acquire plural agreement within the NP (noun phrase) at 3;2 and 3;1 respectively and Eve at 2;3. Invariably, lexical plurals emerge first and plural
agreement between quantifier, determiner and the head noun in the NP is acquired later. It is of interest to the field to check whether English L2 behaves in a similar progression as L1.

Turning now to SLA, Huebner (1983) conducted the first longitudinal study of adult learning English L2. He looked at the micro-analysis of the interlanguage of an adult Hmong speaker acquiring English L2 naturally, that is without formal instruction, in Hawaii over a one-year period. He investigates three syntactic features: (i) Standard English (SE) copula such as is (a); (ii) the article da that means the in SE and (iii) anaphora. In summary, Huebner’s (1983, 1985) investigation suggests that grammatical development of one area of interlanguage may be nonlinear (e.g., the use of an article da in obligatory SE contexts increased from recording 1 to recording 2, decreased through the next two, then increased through the seventh and following tapes) and exposes underlying cognitive processes. Huebner (1983, 1985) states that interlanguage constitutes learners’ linguistic system at the time of language learning and hence, interlanguage should not be looked at from a target language point of view. Thus, longitudinal studies in L2 acquisition are crucial since learners’ interlanguage is a dynamic process, not a static one.

Later research into the acquisition of morphemes in English L2 found similar sequences to Brown’s (1973) study, for example, in children (Dulay & Burt, 1973) and adults (Bailey et al., 1974). These studies find that L1 and L2 children, as well as L2 adults, acquire grammatical morphemes almost in the same order of acquisition.

In terms of the acquisition of plural marking in other ESL studies, there are some cross-sectional and longitudinal studies with a range of findings. In the early cross-sectional morpheme studies (e.g., Dulay & Burt, 1973 and Krashen, 1976, 1981), they found that plural marking -s was acquired at an early stage. However, Hakuta’s
longitudinal study (1976) found that the plural marking -s is acquired last among other morphemes. Another longitudinal study conducted by Jia (2003), focusing on the acquisition of English plurals in 10 Chinese children aged five to 16 years in the United States, found that only seven of these 10 learners did so after five years of exposure. Jia’s error analysis-oriented study uses accuracy (80% over consecutive sessions) as a criterion for acquisition and does not differentiate between plural marking at lexical and phrasal levels as Brown (1973) did.

It is relevant to note that, out of the morpheme studies of Dulay and Burt (1973) and later Bailey, et al. (1974), a position emerges, which opposes the teaching of grammar to children or other L2 learners because it is ineffective. The message is that the teaching method should be focused on the use of language. This position became prominent and paved the way to ‘communicative’ approaches to teaching. Communicative language teaching (CLT) strives to develop the communicative competence of the learners, which focuses on the proper use of language in the real situation (Hymes, 1972).

Studies based on Processability Theory

In the Asian context, recent literature on child L2 plural development within the PT framework pays particular attention to bilingual first language acquisition (BFLA) in a one-parent-one-language context and child SLA. Itani-Adams (2007), for instance, conducted a three-year longitudinal study of a Japanese-English child from age 1;11 in Australia. She examined the development of lexical, morphological, and syntactic structures in the two languages. Analysis showed that both Japanese and English lexicon and grammar develop as predicted by PT and like Brown’s (1973) study. The child attained plural marking -s on single nouns at age 2;4 and NP agreement emerges at age 3;0.
Yamaguchi (2009, 2010) and Di Biase et al. (2015) conducted research on the development of English L2 morphology and syntax in a primary-school aged Japanese child in Australia over two years. They found that the child acquired plural marker -s on nouns (e.g., books) after two months of natural exposure to English L2. Later, as predicted by PT, the child acquired noun phrase (NP) plural agreement first with numerals (e.g., two books) after seven months and finally, with indefinite quantifiers (e.g., a lot of books) after 11 months.

Further, Mohamed Salleh and colleagues (2016, 2017) investigated early bilingual development of Malay and English, focusing on the development of plural marking in a child raised in these two languages from birth, firstly in Malaysia and then in Australia from 2;10. They found that the child acquired English plural marking -s on single nouns from 3;6. The child was able to produce NP plural agreement with numeral and some indefinite quantifiers (e.g., two cats; many cats), at 3;8, which satisfied the emergence criteria. From 3;9 to 3;10, the child continued to produce indefinite quantifiers with nouns but without marking the plural morpheme (e.g., many cat). They also found a cross-linguistic influence in the two systems of plurality in Malay and English. Some plural categories in one language are also used occasionally in the other language. Like Indonesian, plurality in Malay can be expressed through various forms of reduplication and this may have resulted in the child occasionally using iteration in the English contexts (e.g., cat cat cat). Likewise, the plural suffix -s occasionally appears in the Malay contexts (e.g., mainans “toys”). It can be concluded at this point that these longitudinal studies in BFLA or ESL show that the development of plural marking -s on nouns is compatible with PT hypotheses for L2 English morphology (Pienemann, 1998), i.e., lexical plural is acquired before the phrasal plural with agreement in the noun phrase.
Three other studies (Zhang and Widyastuti, 2010; Burhansyah, 2018; Burhansyah and Whong, 2020) using PT to examine the acquisition of English L2 involve Indonesian participants. Zhang and Widyastuti (2010) researched the acquisition of morphology in English L2 of three members of an Indonesian family who had lived in Australia for a year in various contexts of English L2 learning. They examined the acquisition of six English morphemes (past tense -ed, plural -s, (stand–alone) V–ing form, Aux +V forms, including progressive be+V–ing, perfective have+V–en, and Modal+V) in the interlanguage of three members (parents and five-year-old daughter). The speech data were collected through oral interviews. Results indicated that three members of the family were at different stages of English L2 morphological development. The father was the most advanced and the daughter the least. In terms of plural marking, the daughter acquired lexical plural -s (e.g., girls and friends). The mother was able to produce lexical and phrasal plural and the father was able to reach 80% accuracy level for acquiring the plural -s. This study suggests that a systematic developmental profile of each informant is compatible with the developmental hierarchy for English morphology.

Burhansyah (2018) conducted a longitudinal case study of the development of English plurality in an Indonesian child aged 9;2, which focuses on plural marking in written English using a PT framework. The data was collected at 10 points in time during the period of 10 months in the form of picture-guided narrative and descriptive writing. This study found that plural marking -s on nouns emerged at Time 7 until Time 10. The results indicate that the developmental of plural marking -s in the written production seems to follow the sequences in PT.

Most recently, Burhansyah and Whong (2020) conducted a longitudinal study on the acquisition of English plural marking involving 10 adults in Indonesian
university students who learned English L2 in a formal context within a PT framework. To elicit the data, the participants were assigned translation tasks from Indonesian to English. This study found that before semester began, the participants acquired plural marking -s on nouns without quantifiers first, then at the end of semester they were able to mark plural -s on nouns with quantifiers.

The results of these longitudinal studies in Indonesian (Zhang & Widyastuti, 2010; Burhansyah, 2018; Burhansyah & Wong, 2020) and Asian contexts in particular BFLA studies (Itani-Adams, 2007; Mohamed Salleh et. al., 2016; Mohamed Salleh, 2017) and child SLA (Yamaguchi, 2010; Di Biase et. al., 2015), indicate the development of plural marking -s on nouns are compatible with PT prediction of the developmental stages for L2 English morphology (Pienemann, 1998). This means participants acquire the lexical plural before the phrasal plural with NP agreement.

However, Dao’s cross-sectional study (2007) reported contradictory results. Dao (2007) investigated the emergence of plural, phrasal plural, possessive-marking, and verbal agreement in 36 Vietnamese school students, aged 13-18, who learned English as a foreign language at three secondary and three high schools in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. Based on Dao’s data (2007), Charters, Dao, and Jansen (2011) identified a conflict between Dao’s study (2007) and PT’s (Pienemann, 1998) prediction of plural marking. Students from Years 7 to 12 who had been studying English for between one and six years prior to data collection were randomly selected to participate. The study conducted 10-minute, one-on-one sessions. Plural data are elicited using picture-description and memory tasks. Dao found that six out of the 36 Vietnamese students acquired plural NP agreement (numeric quantifiers agreeing with noun) before lexical plural marking. Dao’s results do not support PT’s developmental stages for L2-English morphology. However, Dao’s (2007) results, being from a cross-sectional study,
reflect a particular moment in development rather than a developmental sequence. In fact, nothing is known about whether those six informants (i.e., about 17%) may have learned the lexical plural at an earlier stage. The study does not explain why 83% of the students did show both PT stages. Dao’s study exemplifies the sort of pitfalls that may result from assuming development purely from cross-sectional studies when researching L2 acquisition to identify developmental paths such as those conducted in Italian L2 (Di Biase, 2002, 2008), Swedish L2 (Pienemann & Håkansson, 1999; Håkansson & Norrby, 2010) and German L2 (Baten, 2013).

Yet, cross-sectional as well as corpus studies, which are usually conducted with larger number of informants than longitudinal studies, are useful in confirming patterns found in longitudinal studies. Bonilla (2015), for example, examined a corpus of 21 instructed learners of Spanish L2 from the United Kingdom and Sakai (2008) conducted a cross-sectional study of seven Japanese University learners of English L2. Both projects confirmed the PT hypotheses using implicational scaling calculations. The following section explains the Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form (DMFonF) instructional approach used in the present study.

3.5 Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form (DMFonF)

The current study uses an instructional approach in an L2 English program, which Di Biase (2002, 2008) refers to as developmentally moderated focus on form (DMFonF). Within DMFonF, the teaching program follows the stages outlined in PT. Di Biase combines Pienemann’s (1984, 1998) teachability hypothesis and his general developmental approach to language learning and teaching with Long’s (1991) focus on form (FonF) feedback to develop an essentially meaning-based instructional program.
In the early studies of SLA, many researchers found that naturalistic and instructed learners followed the same developmental sequences of acquisition in morphology and syntax (e.g., Dulay & Burt, 1973; Meisel, et.al., 1981: Krashen & Terrel, 1983; Pica, 1983). This means that instructed L2 learners were not able to disregard the natural developmental route (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Those findings led Pienemann (1984) to put forward his Teachability Hypothesis, which assumed that the effect of instruction is constrained by the learner’s stage of development. The Teachability Hypothesis becomes a theoretical consequence of PT, which predicts that all L2 language learners follow a fixed developmental order, in both morphological and syntactical structures (Pienemann, 1998). According to Pienemann’s (1984), “an L2-structure can only be learned by instruction if the learner’s interlanguage is close to the point when this structure is acquired in the natural setting” (p. 198). In other words, the stages of L2 development cannot be skipped through formal instruction.

Pienemann’s Teachability Hypothesis (1984) points out that the form to be taught will be effective if the learners are ‘developmentally ready’ for that particular structure (cf. Mackey 1999). According to the Teachability Hypothesis (Pienemann, 1984), a particular structure is teachable if the learner has acquired the stage just prior to that structure. For instance, if the learner is assessed to be at the first stage of development (i.e., lemma access, see Table 5), the teachability hypothesis would predict that the learner cannot learn a structure from the third stage of development, such as phrasal agreement, if they have not first learned to mark the plural on lexical items (second stage). That is, the form to be taught (in the teaching program, including feedback) may only be learned if the learner is ‘developmentally ready’ for that structure (c.f. Mackey, 1999). Evidence for this stepwise development is in any case
widely available from other research testing the Teachability Hypothesis (e.g., Bonilla, 2015; Roos, 2016; Baten, 2019). Available research found that all learners progressed without skipping any stages.

Thus, ideally, the teaching method and the feedback approach should consider the learner’s current developmental stage. FonF is an instructional approach, which “overtly draws attention to the linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication” (Long, 1991, pp. 45-46). For Long, the incidental nature of FonF is central and it refers exclusively to feedback rather than to the instructional program itself. In contrast, DMFonF – rather than waiting to react to an incidental communicative problem – takes a proactive approach to teaching. It does this by focusing on a specific (developmentally moderated) form for some part of the lesson, which is otherwise broadly communicative and meaning-based, and the teacher only gives feedback on the form currently being focused on, disregarding other linguistic errors.

Thus DMFonF, taking advantage of previous research (Di Biase, 2002, 2008), assumes that development will follow a specific path that facilitates the learner to progress along that path by creating communicative opportunities to use that form. Based on his earlier research on learning L2-Italian, Di Biase designed a DMFonF program for L2-Italian, which specifies the structures and the order in which they should be dealt with, communicatively, in the classroom, both in the programming and in the feedback given to learners. A study designed along such lines was conducted within an Italian language program in three Sydney primary schools (Di Biase, 2002). In Di Biase’s (2002, 2008) study, the early primary school pupils receiving Italian L2 instruction within their school program were at Stage 1 before the experimental study started although they had been learning Italian L2 for 2-3 years. The Italian L2
program only had two hours per week and all the children did learn many lexical items and some formulaic expressions. Both experimental and control groups received the same program since it was not ethically possible to deliver the program only to one group. The difference was in the feedback given to the groups. In the experimental group the teacher’s feedback only focused on the currently taught form but in the control group the teacher could give feedback on any error. Both the experimental and the control groups achieved PT Stage 3 over the 18 weeks of instruction. These results suggest developmentally moderated instruction with FonF helps to speed up language learning. However, the experimental group (with both DMFonF instruction and feedback) experienced more consistent language development than the control group.

Di Biase (2002) also investigates the teacher’s linguistic behaviour in the classroom to explore why one group had a better result than the other group and to examine the teacher’s interpretation of FonF. Di Biase made a list of the teacher’s linguistic behaviour categories in the classroom, consisting of instruction and feedback. This present study adopts Di Biase’s linguistic behaviour categories (2002) to assess the feedback the teacher used in the classroom during the program. Details of teacher’s linguistic behaviour categories based on Di Biase (2002) can be found in Chapter 4 Subsection 4.4.4. In the next section, the research gap, questions, and hypothesis of this present study are presented.

3.6 Research gap, questions, and hypothesis

3.6.1 Research gap and questions

Doughty and Long (2003) reviewed that the majority of SLA studies have been conducted cross-sectionally on child and adult learners (e.g., Dulay & Burt, 1973, 1974a; Bailey, et al., 1974). However, longitudinal studies of SLA on children and
adults are scarce (e.g., Hakuta, 1974, 1976, 1978; Huebner, 1983, 1985; Iwasaki, 2008; Kawaguchi & Yamaguchi, 2019). Studies of English L2 focusing on teaching and learning processes in young children are limited, particularly in Indonesian kindergartens. Available BFLA studies and child SLA investigate children learning English in naturalistic environments, whereas the present study examines the learning of English L2 by kindergarten-aged children in an instructed L2 setting.

The current study attempts to contribute to SLA knowledge by filling the above mentioned theoretical and methodological gaps and is guided by the following research questions.

1. How effective is the Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form (DMFonF) intervention in the meaning based English L2 kindergarten program with younger children in an Indonesian multilingual context? In particular:
   a) What lexical and grammatical development did the kindergarten children develop in English L2 before the DMFonF intervention?
   b) Does the DMFonF intervention promote English lexical and grammatical development in the kindergarten children?
   c) Does the children’s development follow the developmental trajectory predicted by PT?

2. What kind of linguistic environment did the teacher provide in terms of DMFonF instruction and feedback?

3. What are the teacher’s and parents’ perceptions towards the English L2 program at the kindergarten?
3.6.2 Hypothesis

Question 1 tests a hypothesis based on Di Biase (2002) “...regardless of program type or methodology adopted by the teacher, students learning a second language will, fundamentally, follow the same developmental path. However, where the teacher adopts instructional strategies with a consistent ‘focus on form’ students’ progression along the developmental path will be faster” (p. 100). Further, Di Biase (2008) states that “...developmentally guided form-oriented instruction plus FonF feedback is effective: it promotes faster acquisition of learnable structures” (p. 215-216).

Based on the above claims, this research hypothesises that children will achieve better linguistic outcomes in terms of speed and the attainment of lexical and grammatical learning by receiving the DMFonF instruction and feedback. In terms of the PT developmental path, the achievements of Indonesian kindergarten children are compatible with the morphological development hypothesised for English L2 in PT (Pienemann, 1998, 2005).

3.7 Summary

This chapter reviews early and current theories, approaches and application of SLA to teaching methods, including PT as the theoretical framework of this study and empirical studies of English L2 with a focus on research from Asia. It identifies early studies, theories and teaching methods of SLA prior to PT and reviews the interactionist approaches in SLA. The development of PT as a theoretical framework, including the influence of Levelt’s speech model and LFG are identified. The effectiveness of DMFonF as an instructional approach to L2 learning is also discussed in this chapter. In reviewing the existing literature, this chapter highlights the limited research exploring kindergarten children’s acquisition of English L2 in an Indonesian
context using PT. This present research hopes to contribute to bridging the gap. The next chapter presents the research method of the current study.
CHAPTER 4. RESEARCH METHOD

The previous chapter reviews early SLA research, including PT as the framework of this study, and second language teaching methods employed over the last few decades. This chapter presents the research method of the current study across five sections. Section 4.1 provides an overview of the research design. Section 4.2 details the research setting and the participants. Section 4.3 describes the data collection processes for the linguistic data and qualitative data, including the questionnaire and interview data. Section 4.4 elaborates on the data analysis of the linguistic data, using PT stages, the distributional analysis and implicational scaling and the teacher’s linguistic behaviour. Section 4.5 details the data analysis of the questionnaire and interview using content analysis. The final section summarises this chapter.

4.1 Research design

This study examines the language development in English as a foreign language in Indonesian kindergarten children resulting from the instruction in the English L2 program. There are three main questions in this study relating to the effect of Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form (DMFonF) intervention in the English L2 kindergarten program, the teacher’s implementation of the DMFonF intervention in the classroom, as well as the teacher’s and parents’ perceptions of the English L2 program at the kindergarten. The first two questions relate to linguistic input (teacher) and output (children), and the third question relates to educational support.
To address the research questions, this study employs mixed methods by conducting quantitative and qualitative approaches. For the main study, this research uses a longitudinal, quasi-experimental classroom-based study (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991) by using DM FonF instruction, which involves both qualitative and quantitative analysis. This longitudinal quasi-experimental study was conducted over one school semester (i.e., six months) and adopted a pre-test, intervention, and post-test. A delayed post-test, i.e., six months after the post-test, was conducted cross-sectionally to check whether the children still maintained their lexical and grammatical knowledge learned from the DMFonF program.

This research also used questionnaire data to gather information from the children’s parents. For the qualitative method, this study draws on semi-structured interviews with the teacher and the children’s parents to complement the analysis.

### 4.2 Research setting and participants

#### 4.2.1 Research setting

The participating kindergarten in the study is in a middle-class residential area in Bandung, the capital city of West Java province. This present study was held in an Islamic, private fee-paying kindergarten in Bandung, which offers English as part of the school curriculum. Children in the school learn three languages: Indonesian, English and Sundanese. The kindergarten program includes three hours per day of English on school weekdays. The kindergarten teachers use both English and Indonesian as instructional languages in delivering the English L2 program. The kindergarten establishes guidelines for the English L2 program by creating weekly themes such as colours; fruit and vegetables; and animals. The focused approach correlates with the general kindergarten educational program (Ministry of Education
and Culture, 2014) without any linguistic modules. Therefore, the teachers constructed the details of the English L2 syllabus based on the themes from the school curriculum.

4.2.2 The Participants

Prior to the research, the researcher contacted the principal of the kindergarten in Bandung via email about recruiting potential participants for the study. The researcher chose this school because it offers an English program for an extended period (over 10 years). The principal expressed an interest in having someone observe the program with a view to improving it. Once the research was approved, the researcher held a meeting with the principal and the teachers to advise them of the current project. The researcher also distributed the recruitment documentation, including participant information sheets and consent forms to the teachers. They were given one week to decide if they would participate. One teacher agreed to participate in the research. Therefore, only the children of two groups in her classroom participated in the research.

As part of a new semester, the principal held a meeting with the teacher, the children’s parents and the researcher. In the meeting, the researcher explained the purpose, design and benefits of the research to potential participants. The researcher explained any involvement was voluntary and anyone could withdraw at any time without repercussion. The recruitment documents, including participant information sheets and consent forms, were then distributed to the parents or caregivers, who were responsible for the children and legally had to give authority for the children to participate in this study. Those parents who were interested in their children’s participation returned the consent form after around one week to the office or the teacher.
The researcher also recruited the parents or caregivers whose children were involved in this research. These parents received the same information as the children and were allowed at least one week to consider their participation in this study. Those who were interested were asked to return the consent form to the office or the teacher. The participants of this current study involved one kindergarten teacher, 20 children in the formal classroom context as well as 20 parents in an informal (outside the classroom) context.

4.2.3 Formal context: Children’s linguistic data and teacher’s linguistic behaviour

The participating children were from one first-year class (K1) and aged between four-to-five-years old (n=10), and one second-year class (K2) aged between five-to-six-years old (n=10). Both K1 and K2 had the same teacher who was a non-native speaker of English. Before the project began, K1 children had learned English for six months (i.e., one semester) and K2 children, who were one year ahead of K1, had learned English for three semesters. They had learnt through communicative meaning-based instruction that focused on English expression and vocabulary learning.

Both groups followed the same DMFonF syllabus with the same teacher in year 1 and year 2 within their respective meaning-based program. For ethical reasons it was not possible, in any case, to administer different programs to the two groups. The research project was conducted over one school semester, i.e., the second semester of the year, in parallel for both groups: K1 in the morning and K2 in the afternoon. This is because K2 children learned Indonesian within the general kindergarten educational program for about three hours in the morning session. In the afternoon session, they learned the English L2 program for about three hours. The K2 children alternated these
learning times with the K1 children because they had the same teacher in the English L2 program. Tables 7 and 8 below provide basic demographic information about the children’s participation in the quasi-experimental program across the K1 and K2 groups.

Table 7. An overview of children’s participation in K1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Participants’ code names</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Language Spoken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>L1: Sundanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tsa</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>L1: Sundanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Niz</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fap</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hai</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dac</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: M (Male), F (Female)
Table 8. An overview of children’s participation in K2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Participants’ code names</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Language Spoken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fah</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vit</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aqa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Que</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Far</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Zai</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Aqi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Raf</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2: English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of the questionnaire distributed to the 20 families of the participating children, all K1 and K2 children had Indonesian as their L1, except for Pan from K1 who had L1 Sundanese. For the second language, most children had Sundanese as their L2. The other children had English, Indonesian and Javanese as their L2. Eleven children lived in nuclear families and nine children lived in extended families.

The participating teacher, Sarah, was a non-native speaker of English. The teacher had Sundanese as her L1 and Indonesian as her L2. The purpose of the
teacher’s participation in this study was to examine how she implemented the intervention of the English L2 program in the classroom.

4.2.4 Informal context: Questionnaires and interviews

The aim of involving parents in this study was to obtain their perceptions regarding the English L2 program and the informal supports for the children to learn English at home. The informal context in this study constitutes supplementary data to identify any potential reasons for the outcome of DM FonF intervention.

The participants in the informal context were 20 parents of the children. The children’s parents in K1 and K2 were from middle-class socioeconomic status. Twenty parents completed the online or paper questionnaires. Nine parents participated in the interview sessions, four parents from K1 (Did, Fin, Net and Eli) and five parents from K2 (Aep, Lis, Vik, Ast and Win). The following tables provide an overview of participating parents in the survey.

Table 9. An overview of parents’ participation in the survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Participants’ code names</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Language spoken</th>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Child’s name</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>L1: Sundanese L2: Indonesian</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>housewife</td>
<td>Dac</td>
<td>K1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Net</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>L1: Sundanese L2: Indonesian</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>English teacher at the kindergarten</td>
<td>Niz</td>
<td>K1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eli</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>L1: Sundanese L2: Indonesian</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>K1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ary</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>L1: Sundanese L2: Indonesian</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>Tsa</td>
<td>K1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ren</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>L1: Sundanese L2: Indonesian</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>private employee</td>
<td>Fap</td>
<td>K1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Language Level 1</td>
<td>Language Level 2</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Did</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td>L1: Sundanese</td>
<td>L2: Indonesian</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>civil servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>civil servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: English</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>bank employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Naj</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: English</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ena</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>principal at elementary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lis</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>L1: Javanese</td>
<td>L2: Indonesian</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dew</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Aep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
<td>High school Year 12</td>
<td>bartender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ast</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>private employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ira</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: Sundanese</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: Palembangnese</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Win</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: -</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>dermatologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rat</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td>L1: Sundanese</td>
<td>L2: Indonesian</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vik</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: Javanese</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>private employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ika</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>L1: Indonesian</td>
<td>L2: Javanese</td>
<td>High school Year 12</td>
<td>housewife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ethical issues**

To protect the anonymity of participants and maintain confidentiality, the participants’ names were coded. In the quasi-experimental research (pre-test, instruction program, post-test, and delayed post-test), the researcher and the teacher used teaching materials in the English L2 program such as pictures, flashcards, toys, and games in a fun way. If any children were reluctant to participate in the research activities, they were not forced to do so. The research activities were conducted in the usual classroom, so the children felt comfortable and familiar with their environment.

4.3 **Data collection**

This section describes the data collection processes. It includes the linguistic data; the questionnaire and interview data; field notes, audio, and video recordings as well as transcription and coding.

4.3.1 **Linguistic Data: Pre-test, Intervention, Post-test, and Delayed Post-test**

This current study adopts a ‘pre-test, intervention, post-test and delayed post-test’ approach (see Figure 4.1 below). Before the study began, meetings were organised between the researcher and the classroom teacher to discuss lesson plans and the proposed English program for K1 and K2 groups. This research also uses field notes taken during observation of DMFonF classes to record events during the program.

Figure 4 summarises the data collection schedule in K1 and K2 groups.
Figure 4. Data collection schedule of K1 and K2

A pre-test taking about 15-20 minutes, was conducted with the participants in K1 and K2 to identify a linguistic baseline for each child. Data were collected using picture tasks (see Appendix 1), including children’s production of English lexicon (noun, adjective, numeral, etc.), grammatical encoding relating to noun phrase constructions and singular-plural expressions. Picture elicitation tasks aimed to facilitate the production of lexical items and early grammatical structures such as plural marking in various linguistic environments to assess the developmental readiness of the children.

The pre-test, as the baseline, was undertaken via one-on-one conversations in English between the researcher and each child, one at a time, using specific communication tasks to elicit speech production samples. The conversation was audio recorded outside the classroom to check if the child had the concept of singular and plural in English, e.g., *apple* (singular) and *apples* (plural). The study uses a picture description task like that described in Di Biase (2008), e.g., showing the child a card with one star and then another one with many stars to elicit singular/plural contrasts. The pre-test session provided about 24 opportunities for lexical plural and 24 for phrasal plural.

After the children’s baselines in English were established, the English intervention program was conducted over 12 weeks as initial part (20-25 minutes) of
the three-hour English program. The program consisted of two 20–25-minute interventions per week using DMFonF, including task-based communicative learning activities. The reason why this length of time was chosen because this was the longitudinal study and the DMFonF was an additional component and intended to minimise intervention in the normally communicative meaning based English L2 program. The form to be focused followed PT stages: the baseline analysis found that most children were at Stage 1. Therefore, the DMFonF instructions followed Stage 1, 2 and 3 over the intervention period. Each session of the program was video and audio recorded.

The classroom teacher instructed the English L2 program during the semester following the set of the kindergarten curriculum. Introducing grammatical structures followed the developmental stages as defined by PT (Pienemann, 1998).

In the DMFonF classroom, given the children's ages, the teacher did not give formal explanations of the plural marking. The concept of plural marking was introduced using pictures (cards depicting single items, e.g., one cat vs. cards depicting plural items e.g., many cats) in the class. First, the children learned various lexical items (single words, invariant form) in English such as animals, fruits, colours, numbers, and so on as well as greetings and other formulaic expressions used in classroom interaction (i.e., Stage 1).

The next component consisted of lexical categories and features. For example, number marking on nouns (triangle/triangles) and noun phrases consisting of adjective and noun (e.g., red flower/red flowers) (i.e., Stage 2). An example classroom activity was introducing the concept of plurality. The teacher showed the picture of one apple and said the word apple and encouraged the children to repeat the word. The same happened with pictures of other fruits known by the children.
Stage 3 in PT consisted of phrasal agreement in the noun phrase, for example, \textit{two triangles, many cats}. After the children learned the names and could recall them in association with a picture, the teacher then showed the children a picture of many apples or many mangos and pronounced the respective plural forms (for example, \textit{a lot of apples, a lot of green mangos}); and encouraged the children to repeat them. The teacher contrasted the pictures, showing one piece of a particular fruit and many pieces of the same fruit, and similarly for animals and other countable items. In this exercise, the teacher gave feedback to the children only on the forms being focused on such as plural marking and noun phrases and disregarded other linguistic errors such as pronunciation.

One week following three months with DMFonF instruction, a post-test was undertaken to check the lexicon and grammatical items kindergarten children may have acquired through the DMFonF English program. This was carried out individually by the researcher with each child, like the pre-test.

Six months after the post-test, a delayed post-test was conducted in the same format. The purpose of the delayed post-test was to check whether the children still retained the knowledge of English lexical items and grammatical structures learned from the program in the long-term. When the delayed post-test was conducted, the K1 children attained the second year of kindergarten while the K2 children had graduated from kindergarten and entered Year 1 in primary school.

\subsection*{4.3.2 Questionnaire and interview data}

The questionnaire and individual interviews with parents were used to elicit the participants’ views. The main themes underlying the study were integrated into both the questionnaire and interviews to see how their perspectives regarding the English
L2 program differed or coincided. Both the questionnaire and interviews were conducted in Indonesian.

**Questionnaire data**

The questionnaire was distributed on paper or online via Google forms, which consisted of three types of questions, namely factual, behavioural, and attitudinal (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). In this study, the factual questions covered language background such as first and second language of the respondents. The behavioural questions in this study included the use of English at home and other supports for the children learning English. The attitudinal questions in this study include the parents’ expectations from the English program at the kindergarten as well as their opinions about the English program.

The questionnaire consists of 16 items: items 1–13 seek basic demographic information about the participants by ticking a particular box or inserting a word or short phrase; and items 14–16 are a combination of quantitative, which invite parents to express their perceptions on a four-point Likert scale and qualitative by answering open-ended questions for additional comment on each item (see Appendix 5).

**Interview data**

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the children’s parents and the classroom teacher (see Appendix 6). A semi-structured interview “allows the researcher to ‘probe’ for more detailed responses where the respondent is asked to clarify what they have said” (Gray, 2004, p. 214). Interviews with some parents were conducted after collecting the questionnaires to get a better understanding of the questionnaire results (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). Interview sessions were held at school when the parents dropped off and picked up their children for 10 minutes. The
main themes of the interviews included the reasons for choosing the specific kindergarten, the motivation for the children to learn English, and the practice of English at home, including the informal English learning opportunities for the kindergarten children. The purpose of collecting parents’ data through questionnaires and interview was to complement children’s language development data, to identify possible reason why specific children achieve better than the others and to explore parents’ perceptions regarding the English L2 program.

The semi-structured interview with the teacher was divided into three sessions. Each session lasted for 20 minutes. The first session was before the program started. In this session, the participating teacher had an informal conversation with the researcher about the lesson plans, including the teaching materials on the topics in the kindergarten curriculum. The second session was held in the middle of the DMFonF instruction. In this session, the researcher and the teacher watched the video recordings of the teacher delivering the program in the classroom to discuss and reflect on teaching strategies and practices. In the last session, after the program had finished, the teacher reflected on her teaching strategies and classroom practice.

4.3.3 Audio and video recording

The English program teaching and learning sessions in the classroom were video and audio recorded. The recordings captured the processes of the teacher giving input (lexical items and grammatical forms) and feedback to the children, as well as any output (oral production) from the children. Interviews sessions with the teacher and the parents were also audio-recorded outside of the classroom.
4.3.4 Transcription and Coding

Linguistic data

The linguistic data in the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests, as well as DMFonF classroom interaction video data, were transcribed and fed into ELAN (Sloetjes & Wittenburg, 2008). This study uses orthographic transcription in the recordings. The following figures are the screenshots of ELAN during the pre-test and DMFonF instruction in K1.

Figure 5. A screenshot of ELAN during the pre-test in K1

---

6 ELAN stands for Eudico Linguistic Annotation, which was developed at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen, The Netherlands (Hellwig, 2018, p. viii). It is an annotation tool that enables the researcher to create, edit and visualise video and audio resources (Hellwig, 2018) The researcher used two versions of ELAN, namely ELAN version 5.3 (2018) and 5.7-FX (2019).
After transcribing the speech data on ELAN, all transcriptions were written on
the ELAN tiers, i.e., sets of annotations in the orthographic transcription from the
speakers’ utterances (Hellwig, 2018). The orthographic transcriptions from ELAN
were converted to Word files following Di Biase’s (2000) transcription convention.
The transcriptions in the speech data were written in English using Turn to represent
each speaker in a session. According to Di Biase (2000), Turn is “a normally
continuous (including pauses) utterance of a speaker, until the interlocuter (i.e., the
other participant in the interaction) either takes his/her turn where he/she judges to be
the end of the first speaker’s utterance or interrupts the first speaker’s utterance in
order to take his/her turn” (p. 100). The speaker codes in the transcription were T for
Teacher, R for Researcher, and other code names for the children, e.g., Kin, Aqa and
Fap. The following example (4.1) presents the transcription between Researcher (R)
and Hai from K1 in the post-test.

(4.1) A brief example of transcription in the post-test
1 R what is your name?
2 Hai Hai
On the left side of the transcription is the turn number of each speaker. After the turn number is the speaker code and the speaker’s utterance.

Coding questionnaires data

The questionnaire data from Google Forms and paper form were translated from Indonesian to English by the researcher who is an Indonesian-English bilingual. To compile the completed questionnaires, the researcher inputted the data from the paper questionnaires into Google forms. The data were then copied to a computer spreadsheet program, i.e., Excel.

The researcher coded the responses based on the questions. For the closed-ended questions using Likert scales (e.g., “strongly disagree” = 1, “disagree” = 2, “neutral” = 3, “agree” = 4, “strongly agree” = 5), the coding was straightforward (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). For the coding of open-ended questions that required longer responses, the researcher identified the responses based on the similarities and the differences; the researcher then interpreted the answers and developed categories (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010).

Transcription and coding interview data

The semi-structured interview sessions were conducted with the teacher and the parents in Indonesian. The interview data were transcribed and translated from
Indonesian to English with verbatim transcription. According to Poland (1995), verbatim transcription is a reproduction of an audio recording into written words including pauses, incomplete sentences, and interruptions during an interview.

To code the interview data, the researcher used Gibson and Brown’s (2009) types of code, i.e., *a priori*, and *empirical* codes. In the interview context, an *a priori* code is created before the interview process begins while the empirical code arises during the interview. An example of the *a priori* codes is when the researcher asked about the choice of kindergarten, she expected certain responses. Answers that came up that were unexpected are the empirical codes. The following table presents examples of codes used in this study.

**Table 10. Example of codes of participant Did**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Quotes from a transcribed interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A priori code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Empirical code</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of kindergarten</td>
<td>Zah’s sister’s school recommended this kindergarten and also from Zah’s sister literacy course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ motivation for the children learning English L2</td>
<td>English will be a mandatory subject in secondary school so that she can survive in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of English at home</td>
<td>Well, maybe a couple of words that are easy to speak with the child, for example, <em>let’s go to eat.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Data analysis: Linguistic data

This section describes the linguistic data analysis. After collecting the data, the oral production of the children was transcribed and fed into ELAN annotation tool for video and audio resources. Then, KWIC (Key Word in Context) concordance software for Windows (Tsukamoto, 2014), a corpus analytical tool from Nihon University, was used to create word frequency lists and concordances to identify the lexical types and grammatical categories, particularly plural marking. In the concordance, KWIC can list the words alphabetically with the contexts before and after each word and count the frequency of the lexical types in the corpus.

Pienemann’s stages of Processability Theory (1998, 2011a, 2011b) was used to measure the language development of the children. Using this model allowed the researcher to focus on the development processes of the language acquisition of children. Thus, the research includes quantitative and qualitative forms of data analysis to develop a deeper, and more nuanced, understanding of the language development of children in this educational context.

4.4.1 Acquisition criteria

The methodological issue of acquisition criteria of grammatical features has been a controversial and much disputed subject within the field of language acquisition research. The definition of acquisition in early morpheme studies (e.g., Brown, 1973; Dulay & Burt, 1973) follows Cazden’s (1968) acquisition criteria, which are based on accuracy. Cazden (1968) proposes the acquisition point of noun and verb inflections were “the first speech sample of three such that in all three the inflection is supplied in at least 90% of the contexts in which it is clearly required” (p. 435). In 1974, Hakuta modified Cazden’s acquisition criteria and applies them in his study of a Japanese girl
who learned English L2. According to Hakuta (1974), the acquisition point is defined as “the first of three consecutive two-week samples in which the morpheme is supplied in over 90% of obligatory contexts” (p. 25). Later, other researchers set a lower percentage for the accuracy rate, for example, 60% (Vainikka & Young-Scholten, 1994) and 80% (Andersen, 1978). In a more recent study, Jia (2003) uses the accuracy-based criteria in her study on the acquisition of English plural morpheme by native Mandarin Chinese-speaking children.

According to Pallotti and Peloso (2008), the different percentages of accuracy-based criteria rates correlate with the degree of mastery. Thus, the representation of acquisition criteria is seen as arbitrary (Pallotti, 2007). Pienemann (1998) argues, however, that the accuracy-based analysis “does not have the potential of describing the dynamics of interlanguage development even though it produces a neat rank order of accuracy of morpheme insertion” (p. 137). Other researchers (e.g., Meisel, Clausen, & Pienemann, 1981; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991) also assert that the accuracy of morpheme insertion is not a guarantee a particular session will increase steadily and develop in later sessions.

Given these factors, some researchers propose the acquisition criteria should be based on the emergence of linguistic structures such as grammatical form (e.g., Meisel et al., 1981; Pienemann, 1998). Pienemann first introduced the emergence criterion in the ZISA (Zweispracherwerb Italienischer und Spanischer Arbeiter) group, which means ‘Second Language Acquisition of Italian and Spanish Workers’ at the University of Wuppertal in Germany in 1974 (Meisel et al., 1981). Emergence criteria enable the researcher to decide whether a specific structure has been acquired or not. According to Pienemann (1998), emergence criteria are “the point in time at which certain skills have, in principle, been attained or at which certain operations can, in
principle, be carried out” (p. 138). The emergence criteria are satisfied if the production data represent both formal and lexical variation for the same structure. For example, lexical plural in PT is acquired if the production data have both formal (e.g., *ball, balls*) and lexical variation (e.g., *balls, bananas*) (Bettoni & Di Biase, 2015). Pienemann (1998) concludes that the rank orders of accuracy are not valid measures of language development.

According to Pienemann (1998), in PT, the emergence criterion may be implemented to “morphological development, albeit filtered through more refined analyses, which ‘neutralise’ the effect of unanalysed entries into the learner’s lexicon” (p. 144). Furthermore, as suggested by Pienemann (1998), the emergence criterion can be implemented effectively through distributional analysis, as detailed in the following subsection.

### 4.4.2 Distributional analysis

In this current study, a full distributional analysis was conducted to examine the developmental sequence of grammatical structures produced by the L2 learners, particularly the plural structure in English. In the morphological development, the distributional analysis focuses on specific lexical and grammatical structures implied to have been acquired if the emergence criteria are satisfied (Pienemann, 1998). A particular stage in PT has been acquired if the distributional analysis of a learner’s production data demonstrates that it is produced more than once, with lexical and structural variation, and it does not include an echo from the previous speaker’s turn (Di Biase, 1999).

The occurrences of the plural structure are assigned by the emergence criterion and the linguistic contexts. For instance, if the learner produces the lexical item such
as apple (singular) and apples (plural with suffix -s), even though the word apples occurs approximately 10 times in the corpus, it does not mean that the suffix -s is used productively and the occurrences cannot be counted as the lexical plural suppliance. However, if the plural marking -s occurs with another lexical item such as apples and books, then the two occurrences can be assigned as the lexical plural suppliance.

Following Bettoni and Di Biase (2015), any plural structure has been acquired in the children’s speech production when the plural structure emerges in both formal and lexical variation (with at least two different lexical items). In this study, the lexical and grammatical results in K1 and K2 are compared within the group and across groups. The results were checked against the developmental stages hypothesised for English L2 in PT (Pienemann, 2011). The grammatical results, particularly plural development, in both groups were converted into implicational scaling, which indicates that the stage in PT was acquired. The following subsection describes the implicational scaling in this study.

4.4.3 Implicational scaling

In PT (Pienemann, 1998), a particular structure is acquired when the learners produce the lexicon, which satisfies the emergence criterion in the data. To determine the developmental stages, an implicational scaling was needed in this study. Implicational scaling is a method of representing dynamic features of L2 development (Pienemann, 1998). Implicational scaling was adopted to identify the variability and systematicity of L2 data (Pienemann, 1998). According to Pienemann (1998), the basic point of the implicational scaling is:
Cumulative learning processes can be represented by successive addition of linguistic rules to the interlanguage system: rule 1 + rule 2 + rule 3 etc. In this way changes in the interlanguage system can be accounted for by the addition of rules. (p.134).

The table below presents a sample of the implicational scaling for longitudinal data in an individual learner. The first column lists the rules/structures of the interlanguage system, while the other columns list the production data according to the developmental time. The sign (+) indicates that a particular rule is acquired by the learner in at least two occurrences of the lexical variation. The sign (-) indicates that a particular rule is not acquired.

Table 11. Implicational scale for a longitudinal study (Pienemann, 1998, p. 134)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To verify the reliability of the implicational scaling, the scalability should be calculated. As can be seen from Table 11, there is no contradictory evidence from the implicational pattern, which means that the scalability is 1.0. (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991) explain that the coefficient of scalability should be more than 0.6.

4.4.4 Teacher’s linguistic behaviour

This study also analyses teachers’ linguistic behaviour in the English L2 kindergarten program. The purpose of this analysis was to examine how the teachers’ behaviours were different before and during the implementation of the DM FonF intervention in
both groups to identify potential reasons of children’s language development from pre-test to post-test.

Four partial video recordings of the teacher’s classroom interactions before the implementation of DMFonF and six video recordings with both K1 and K2 within the three months of DMFonF program were used to inform the analysis. The six video recordings consist of two meetings at the beginning, two in the middle and two at the end of the program in both groups. The emergence linguistic behaviour is scored using the categories listed in Table 12. The results of the teacher’s linguistic behaviour are more exploratory than the language development results (Di Biase, 2002).

Table 12. Teacher’s linguistic behaviour (Di Biase, 2002, p. 108)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Teacher Linguistic Behaviour in Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Asks question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>No Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+FB</td>
<td>Positive Feedback (+form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Request Repetition (individual or choral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recast (+stress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>(Blang) + [Verbal’ +Parallel (+)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>Provides form (+in FonF schedule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{RW (+)}</td>
<td>Repeat wrong form (+stress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{CL}</td>
<td>Clarification Request (what)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (+)}</td>
<td>Teacher’s explicit correction (+form/EXPL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NOT this but THAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other output enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{EX}</td>
<td>Explanation Request (why)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The codes used in the teacher’s linguistic behaviour as in Di Biase (2002, pp. 108-109) are explained below.

1. Q for Question

The Q code means that the teacher asks a question to the learners.
2. NC for No Correction
   The NC code means that the teacher does not intervene in the event of a student’s production error when the targeted structure is involved.

3. +FB for Positive Feedback (+form)
   The +FB indicates that the explicit approval such as Good! OK! Bravo! and/or when the teacher repeats the form approvingly.

4. RR for Requests Repetition (individual/choral)
   The RR code signifies that the teacher asks the child or the group to repeat (correct) production.

5. CUE provides cue (BL) (–miscue)
   The CUE code means that the teacher provides verbal or non-verbal (Body Language/BL) cues. The examples of verbal cue provide elements for completion (word or phrase without ending), using opposites (e.g., “Is the sun cold?”) or giving parallel expressions, e.g., showing a picture of three black dogs and another with three black cats: “If these are two black dogs these are two ...?”

6. FORM+
   The FORM+ code signifies that the teacher provides a new form (usually if no one else seems to know it).

7. {R for Recast (+stress)
   The {R code means that the simple recast (without stress) is the most common form of corrective feedback (implicit correction), where the teacher correctly recasts an item that the child produces with some formal error. For example, a child produces one books, and the teacher provides recast in the correct form NP agreement one book. The recast may be limited to the wrong word or even just an ending.
8. Negative feedback techniques

The negative feedback techniques include RW: teacher repeats the wrong form; CL: clarification request by the teacher; EX: teacher requests an explanation; EC: teacher engages in explicit correction and may also offer correct form or explanation.

9. O for Other input enhancement used by the teacher

The O code means that this open category attempts to capture forms of input enhancement that cannot be attributed fairly to any of the other categories.

4.5 Data analysis: Questionnaire and interview data

4.5.1 Questionnaire data

The questionnaire data with the parents, including open-ended questions, were analysed using content analysis (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). According to Julien (2008), content analysis is “the intellectual process of categorising qualitative textual data into clusters of similar entities, or conceptual categories, to identify consistent patterns and relationships between variables or themes” (p. 120).

The questionnaire data in this study were obtained to collect background information of the participants in both groups and to know the informal opportunities for the children learning English outside of the school in both groups. The closed-ended questions results were analysed using quantitative content analysis to answer ‘what’ questions in the form of number and percentage (Julien, 2008). The open-ended questions results are presented in the narrative form. The results of questionnaire data in this study are presented in figures. The figures used in this study are charts/diagrams.
4.5.2 Interview data

The interview data with parents and teacher were analysed using content analysis, which can be validated with reflexive iteration. Srivastava and Hopwood (2009) state that reflexive iteration is “... at the heart of visiting and revisiting the data and connecting them with emerging insights, progressively leading to refined focus and understandings” (p. 77). Some theories of sociology of education were used to analyse the choice of kindergarten and parents’ motivation for the children to learn English themes. The practice of English at home and the informal opportunities for the children learning English themes were analysed using the literacy sponsors (Brandt, 1998).

4.6 Summary

This chapter presents the research method of the longitudinal quasi-experimental study of the lexical and grammatical development of English L2 by Indonesian kindergarten children within the framework of PT. First, the research design of this current study is described followed by the research setting and the participants. Then, the method of data collection is presented. This consists of linguistic data; questionnaire and interview data; audio and video recording; as well as transcription and coding. Lastly, the method of data analysis is explained. This includes linguistic data such as acquisition criteria, distributional analysis, and implicational scaling, questionnaire, and interview. The linguistic results in the current study are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5. LINGUISTIC RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The previous chapter describes the research method of this study. This chapter presents the linguistic analyses of the Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form (DMFonF) program in English L2 in Indonesian kindergarten. The following section, 5.1 presents the results of the children’s linguistic baseline before applying the DMFonF program. Section 5.2 presents the lexical and grammatical developments after the teaching intervention. Section 5.3 presents analyses of pre-test and post-test in terms of PT stages, focusing on English plural marking acquisition. Section 5.4 presents the delayed post-test results, that is, six months after the post-test. Section 5.5 demonstrates the implicational scaling according to PT stages in K1 and K2. Section 5.6 presents analysis of how the teacher provided feedback in the English L2 classroom before and during the DMFonF intervention. Lastly, Section 5.6 discusses the chapter.

5.1 Baseline results: Teaching with meaning-based program

Before the DMFonF program began, the participants in K1 and K2 were pre-tested (Time 1) to identify the baseline for each child who were attending a meaning based English L2 program. The baseline results include the lexical and grammatical acquisition achieved by K1 and K2 children.
5.1.1 Lexical acquisition in K1 and K2 at pre-test

Tables 13 and 14 present the pre-test (Time 1) results of English lexical types in K1 and K2, respectively. In these tables, the left column lists the lexical categories produced by the children and the top row lists names of the children (pseudonyms) participating in the study. The final column shows examples of each category produced by the children.

Table 13. K1 baseline: Number of lexical types per informant at Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Informant</th>
<th>Total lexical types</th>
<th>Zah</th>
<th>Kia</th>
<th>Niz</th>
<th>Fap</th>
<th>Sha</th>
<th>Tsa</th>
<th>Pan</th>
<th>Hal</th>
<th>Dac</th>
<th>Kin</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>carrot, dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>am, is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copulas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>yellow, white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite Quantifiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite Quantifiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstratives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>okay, yup, yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Types</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. K2 baseline: Number of lexical types per informant at Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Informant</th>
<th>Total lexical types</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aqa</td>
<td>Fah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copulas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite Quantifiers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite Quantifiers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstratives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Types</strong></td>
<td>229</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two tables show that all children in K1 and K2 produced around the range of six to 73 English lexical types. All children in both groups produced nouns and adjectives, except for Kia in K1 who was not able to produce adjectives. Nouns were the highest lexical types followed by adjectives. According to Gentner and Boroditsky (2001), noun, verb, and adjective in English are categorised as large lexical categories, which have denotational functions. Therefore, many nouns produced by the children in this study show that English is classified as a noun-dominant language (Gentner & Boroditsky, 2001). This is also evident in the previous studies on L1 English monolingual children that nouns are the earliest and predominant lexical type acquired.
by the children (Bloom, Tinker, & Margulis, 1993; Fenson et al., 1994). In BFLA studies, Itani-Adams (2013) and Mohamed Salleh (2017) found that the bilingual child tends to produce the higher use of nouns when speaking in English while recently in the ESL context, Mohamed Salleh, et.al (2020) also found that the noun is the highest lexical type produced by Malay-English bilingual primary school children.

The production of other categories, including verbs, copulas, conjunctions, and formulaic expressions, were scarce and significantly no verb-like items with scant exceptions in either group (as in Di Biase, 2007, with Italian L2 primary school children). Zai was the only child that produced verbs, for example, I never have black and want this. The results indicate that K2 children had a richer lexicon than K1 children, both in terms of lexical size and of emerging lexical categories.

In summary, the K1 and K2 children at the pre-test attained the first PT stage. Since the children in this study produced eight to 159 lexical tokens with around six to 73 lexical types in the recording sessions, they are in the lemma (single words/formulae) stage.

5.1.2 Grammatical acquisition in K1 and K2 at pre-test

Tables 15 and 16 present the baseline results of the noun phrase (NP) structures in K1 and K2. The top row lists the names of the children. The first column lists the noun phrase (NP) structure. The number in the cell presents the frequency of grammatical forms produced by the children.
Table 15. K1 Baseline: Noun phrase structures production at Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun phrase structure</th>
<th>Zah</th>
<th>Kia</th>
<th>Niz</th>
<th>Fap</th>
<th>Sha</th>
<th>Tsa</th>
<th>Pan</th>
<th>Hai</th>
<th>Dao</th>
<th>Kin</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>article+noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>the kitty, the bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>article+noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modifier+noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>kitty cat, unicorn horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective+noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>blue star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possessive+ adjective+noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>my favourite colour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 14, all K1 children are not able to produce noun phrase at Time 1, except Kin. Kin can produce noun phrases consisting of an adjective followed by a noun (e.g., blue star), definite and indefinite article with a noun (e.g., the kitty, the bus, an apple), nouns with a preceding modifier (e.g., unicorn horse, kitty cat) and noun preceded by the possessive pronoun and adjective (e.g., my favourite colour). Kin also produces the highest lexical types (see Table 13). So, Kin seems to have been more advanced in English than other children in K1 before the DMFonF program started.
Table 16. K2 Baseline: Noun phrase structures production at Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun phrase structure</th>
<th>Aqa</th>
<th>Fah</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Dan</th>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Que</th>
<th>Aqi</th>
<th>Raf</th>
<th>Vit</th>
<th>Zai</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>a lot of orange, so many strawberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantifier+noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ten square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantifier+noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun+adjective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>star yellow, star blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective+noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yellow, banana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 16, two K2 children (Jan and Zai) can produce noun phrases consisting of nouns and modifiers. Jan produces an adjective followed by a noun (e.g., yellow banana). Zai produces NP with the noun placed before the adjective (e.g., star yellow, star blue), which may be transferred from the Indonesian NP structure as her L1. Interestingly, Zai was able to produce definite and indefinite quantifiers with a noun in plural contexts but unable to mark plural -s on nouns (e.g., a lot of orange and ten square).

In summary, Kin and Zai are the most advanced among others in producing noun phrase structures. Considering K2 is one year ahead of K1 and these two groups did not show differences in noun phrase productions, the English L2 instruction with the meaning-based program in this study promotes lexical acquisition but seems less likely to promote more complex noun phrase structures.
5.2 Lexical and grammatical development results: Teaching with DM FonF program

This section presents the results of the K1 and K2 children after learning English L2 using the DM FonF program within the meaning-based English program. It first details the analysis of post-test that were conducted individually for all K1 and K2 children to measure lexical and grammatical development that occurred in each child over the DM FonF program. This is followed by a comparison of the lexical development in both groups at pre- and post-test and the noun phrase structure results produced by K1 and K2 children after using the DM FonF program.

5.2.1 Lexical development in K1 and K2

Tables 17 and 18 show the post-test results (Time 2) for K1 and K2 children, respectively, in terms of their lexical growth.

**Table 17. K1: Number of lexical types per informant at Time 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Informant</th>
<th>Total lexical types</th>
<th>Zah</th>
<th>Kla</th>
<th>Niz</th>
<th>Fap</th>
<th>Sha</th>
<th>Tsa</th>
<th>Pan</th>
<th>Hai</th>
<th>Dac</th>
<th>Kin</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>cats, apples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copulas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>blue, brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>I, you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite Quantifiers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>two, five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite Quantifiers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>a lot of, lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The production of lexical types in both K1 and K2 children as, Tables 17 and 18 show, increased significantly at post-test both in terms of lexical categories and
number of types per category. All children in both groups can produce nouns, adjectives, and definite quantifiers, except for Aqa in K2 who produces lexical types only for the noun category and so, like Zah in K1, appears to have no definite or indefinite quantifiers, which might have helped them grasp the plurality feature in nouns.

English-Indonesian mixed lexical items are few and far between but, interestingly, these appear, at T1, in the two lexically most advanced children. Both Kin from K1 and Zai from K2 produced English nouns with the Indonesian suffix -nya, a demonstrative word used as a definite article in Indonesian (Dryer, 2013) i.e., banananya (Kin) and orangenya and heartnya (Zai). At T2 Dan, from K2, attached the English suffix -s to indicate plurality on the Indonesian noun kereta (train) and produced orange keretas (to refer to three orange-coloured trains showing on the researcher’s card) contrasting with white kereta (referring to one white train). Parallel patterns were observed in a recent Malaysian-English bilingual child case study (Mohamed Salleh et al., 2016; Mohamed Salleh, 2017).

Figures 7 and 8 summarise the lexical types of English words produced by K1 and K2 children at the pre- and post-test. The horizontal axis shows the participants’ names, and the vertical axis presents the total number of lexical types produced by the participants.
Figure 7. Types of English words in K1 at pre- and post-test

As can be seen from Figure 7, at the pre-test, K1 children produce the lexical types of English words at around six to 51. Fap produces only six types, which is the least number of lexical types among the group. Kin can produce 51 lexical types, which is the greatest number in the group. After three months with the DMFonF program, the production of English types in K1 improved significantly at around 31 to 64 lexical items. Interestingly, Kin produces 64 types, which is the greatest number among the K1 children.
Figure 8. Types of English words in K2 at pre- and post-test

As shown in Figure 8, all K2 children can produce the types of English words for about nine to 73 at the pre-test. Fah produces nine types, which is the least number in the group. Zai produces the greatest number of lexical types in K2, i.e., 73 at the pre-test. After 12 weeks with the DMFonF program, the production of lexical types in all K2 children, bar one exception, increased significantly at around 19 to 61. However, Zai’s lexical types of production was decreased from 73 at Time 1 to 43 at Time 2.

Table 19 compares K1 and K2 group values of lexical acquisition. At Time 1, K1 produces a total of 156 lexical types (individual mean 15.5, SD=13.6) and K2 produces 229 lexical types (mean 22.9, SD=18.4). This means that at Time 1 K2 children, who were one year ahead of K1 children, had a 47% larger vocabulary size than K1. This result points that the extra year of meaning-based instruction promoted lexical acquisition. At Time 2, K1 increased to a group total of 434 in their production of lexical items (mean 43.4, SD=9), which is almost three times the lexical types as compared to T1. Also, K2 children expanded their lexical production to 442 (mean
44.2, SD=12.1), doubling the lexical size. The values of standard deviation (SD) at Time 2 are smaller than that of Time 1 with both groups. Individual differences had become smaller at Time 2 as indicated by a smaller SD at T2 than T1.

Table 19. Lexical acquisition summary at Time 1 and Time 2 according to the group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time 1 (Baseline)</th>
<th>Time 2 (after DMFonF)</th>
<th>Change from T1 to T2 (frequency)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1 (n=10)</td>
<td>Total 156</td>
<td>Total 434</td>
<td>+ 278 (278%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean 15.6</td>
<td>mean 43.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 13.6</td>
<td>SD 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum 6</td>
<td>Minimum 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 51</td>
<td>Maximum 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2 (n=10)</td>
<td>Total 220</td>
<td>Total 442</td>
<td>+ 213 (183%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean 22.9</td>
<td>mean 44.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 18.4</td>
<td>SD 12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum 9</td>
<td>Minimum 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 73</td>
<td>Maximum 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1-K2 comparison</td>
<td>K2 has 47% more lexical size than K1</td>
<td>K2 has 1.8% more lexical size than K1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K1 and K2 groups show high rates of vocabulary improvement by the post-test time (T2) with K1 children nearly tripling their lexical types and the K2 children more than doubling their lexical types so that K1 almost caught up with K2 on the lexical measure, although both had the same program. One factor that may have given some advantage to K1 is that their DMFonF program was in the morning and K2’s was in the afternoon. Anecdotally, some K2 children complained of being tired in the afternoon class. In any case beyond lexical types, more K2 children produced types in a wider range of categories than K1 children. However, minimum lexical production among the children with K1 at Time 1 was six but it increased to 31 at T2. The increase was not as dramatic for K2 (from nine to 19). It is possible that an earlier start of the
DMFonF program with the K1 group contributed significantly to kick-start English lexical learning among young children.

5.2.2 Grammatical development in K1 and K2

Tables 20 and 21 present the analyses of noun phrase structures produced by K1 and K2 children at Time 2.

Table 20. K1: Noun phrase structures production at Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun phrase structure</th>
<th>Zah</th>
<th>Kia</th>
<th>Niz</th>
<th>Fap</th>
<th>Sha</th>
<th>Tsa</th>
<th>Pan</th>
<th>Hal</th>
<th>Dac</th>
<th>Kin</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adjective+ noun</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>red strawberries,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brown horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite quantifiers+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>four books, two birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite quantifiers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>two red apples, three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+adjective+ noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white horses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After three months of DMFonF instruction, at the post-test, K1 children had expanded their productions in NP constructions. For example, nine out of 10 children were able to produce a range of nominal syntactic constructions with noun heads accompanied by an adjective (e.g., red strawberries, brown horses) and/or definite quantifier (e.g., four books, two red apples, etc). Only Kin was able to produce indefinite quantifiers with a noun three times (e.g., a lot of oranges, lots of strawberries) and an adjective with a noun for four times (e.g., a lot of brown cats, lots of red apples). Zah, in contrast, did not produce any noun phrases.
Table 21. K2: Noun phrase structures production at Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun phrase structure</th>
<th>Aqa</th>
<th>Fah</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Dan</th>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Que</th>
<th>Aql</th>
<th>Raf</th>
<th>Vit</th>
<th>Zal</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adjective+ noun</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yellow bananas, white ducks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite quantifiers+ noun</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>two mangos, four dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite quantifiers + adjective+ noun</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>three brown tables, four brown dogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite quantifier+adjective + noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a lot of carrots, a lot of oranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite quantifier+adjective + noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a lot of red apples, four blue squares</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 21, all K2 children, with one exception, can produce noun phrases consisting of more than a single noun. Five children produce NPs in singular or/and plural contexts, which consist of an adjective with a noun; nine produce definite quantifiers with a noun, and eight produce definite quantifiers followed by adjective and noun. Three children (Far, Que and Aqi) can produce NP with indefinite quantifiers in plural contexts. In summary, these results suggest three months of English L2 program with DMFonF promoted grammatical acquisition, particularly in more complex noun phrase structures.
5.3   Plural development: analysis based on Processability Theory (PT)

This section presents the analyses from the K1 and K2 children, focusing on the acquisition of English plural marking -s on nouns as one of the earliest markers of grammatical development based on PT stages. It first presents the results of grammatical forms in K1 and K2 before implementing the DMFonF program. It then presents the results of grammatical forms in both groups after implementing the DMFonF program.

5.3.1   Plural production results at pre-test

Table 22 presents the pre-test results of grammatical forms in K1, who had so far received a meaning-based English program for one semester only. The pre-test aimed to generate a developmental baseline on which to build the researcher’s and the teacher’s lesson plans and intervention for the following semester. The picture-description task for the pre-test provided 24 stimuli to produce nominals with plural either at lexical or phrasal level. The top row lists the names of the children. The first column lists the PT developmental stages from the lowest at the bottom and the highest at the top. The number in each cell represents the frequency of each PT stage produced by the children.
Table 22. K1 baseline: Grammatical forms results in PT stages at Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage/Informant</th>
<th>Zah</th>
<th>Kla</th>
<th>Niz</th>
<th>Fap</th>
<th>Sha</th>
<th>Tsa</th>
<th>Pan</th>
<th>Hai</th>
<th>Dac</th>
<th>Kin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. NP plural agreement</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lexical plural -s</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>(+1)-16</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>(+2)-19&gt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single word</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*+*: supplied in obligatory contexts; ‘-’: not supplied in obligatory contexts

‘>’: oversupplied; ‘(): insufficient evidence; ‘/’: no context produced

As shown in Table 22, the production frequency for each child is quite different, with most of them producing between one and fewer than nine responses in English. Only one of them (Kin) responded to practically all the plural stimuli in English. Most children would respond to the stimulus often in Indonesian or not at all. The K1 children, with two exceptions, did not distinguish plural from singular forms in their production of English nouns even though the researcher provided as many plural contexts as singular contexts through the picture cards. Thus, a card depicting a single strawberry would be shown to the child before, or after, a card depicting many strawberries. For instance, Niz, who is one of the exceptions, produced one formal contrast of singular versus plural (i.e., heart/hearts) out of 17 cases. However, he does not satisfy the lexical variation criterion. The other exception is Kin (right column in Table 22) who supplied two plural forms and two overextensions out of 21 plural contexts stimuli. Excerpts from Kin’s conversation with the researcher (R) are reproduced in (1a-e) because they help illustrate the nature of the learner language at this early point in time and because they challenge the analyst’s application of the emergence criteria in an interesting way. The comment within brackets, after R’s turn, refers to the image that is being shown on the stimulus card. In transcribed turns, the dot between words signals a short pause and two dots longer pauses.
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(1) a. R what is this? (R shows a card with one red strawberry)
   Kin strawberry
   R good. and what are these? (card with many red strawberries)
   Kin strawberries

b. R yeah good, what is this? (card with one red tomato)
   Kin tomato
   R and what are these? (card with many red tomatoes)
   Kin strawberries ... tomato

c. R what is this? (card with one orange)
   Kin oranges
   R and what are these? (card with many oranges)
   Kin oranges

d. R yes that’s right. what is this? (card with one blue star)
   Kin blue. star
   R and what are these? (card with five blue stars)
   Kin star ... blue star

e. R do you know what this is? (card with one red rose)
   Kin mhm
   R just say it. maybe
   Kin roses
   R what are these? (card with twelve red roses)
   Kin rose
   R and what is this? (R shows again card with one red rose)
   Kin rose

Only Kin produced a lexical plural form more than once with different lexical items (strawberries and oranges). Yet the form-function mapping is not clear, and the emergence criteria are not satisfied, however, because both lexical and formal variation are required in an appropriate context. There is also a requirement of formal variation, that is, of contrast between singular and plural forms in the appropriate context. The only clear formal contrast found is in (1a) that is strawberry in singular context and strawberries in plural context. Tomato in (1b) represents most of the cases produced by Kin and every other child in K1 at pre-test: i.e., a single word-form for
both singular and plural contexts. *Oranges* in (1c) looks like a plural but it may not be counted as such because it is the only form the learner used for both singular and plural contexts. A case of overextension of plural form to singular context is also found in Kin, however, it is a lack of formal variation. This may well signal that the learner has only one form (*oranges*) for both singular and plural contexts.

The example in (1d) above also shows a single form (*blue star*) for either singular or plural but it also reports the only occurrences of adjective and noun utterances in the whole K1 pre-test database. Everyone, except for Kin, only produced one-word responses so they are firmly at the one-word stage in Brown’s (1973) MLU terms. The connection of this MLU stage with the lack of any (morphological) form variation is striking. Finally, in (1e) Kin provides formal variation with *rose vs roses*. The contexts, however, do not allow counting this form variation as evidence of plural marking since the plural form is used in singular context and, vice-versa, the singular form in the plural context. In summary, Kin is remarkably close to acquiring her first structure for the next (lexical) stage. Kin is clearly the most advanced of the K1 children but there is no evidence of systematic and productive use of the structure (Pienemann, 1984; Pallotti, 2007). Thus, like the other nine K1 children, Kin is at the first (lemma) stage.

Next, Table 23 presents the pre-test production of grammatical forms in the K2 group children at the beginning of the second semester in their second year of kindergarten. Like the K1 children, they were presented with approximately 24 opportunities for using the lexical and/or phrasal plural marking.
Table 23. K2 baseline: Grammatical forms results in PT stages at Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Aqa</th>
<th>Fah</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Dan</th>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Que</th>
<th>Aqi</th>
<th>Raf</th>
<th>Vit</th>
<th>Zai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Single word</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lexical plural -s</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>(+1)-3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-8&gt;1</td>
<td>(+1)-8</td>
<td>(+1)-11&gt;2</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>(+1)-13&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NP plural agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 23, four children (Fah, Far, Que and Zai) produce lexical plurals in a single instance. Unfortunately, the grammatical production of the four children does not satisfy the emergence criterion for the lexical stage (Stage 2). Three children in K2 (Dan, Que and Zai) are overgeneralised of the morpheme -s on nouns in singular contexts (e.g., cars to refer to one car, dogs to refer to one dog). Exceptionally, Zai produces five contexts of phrasal agreement: one with a definite quantifier (e.g., ten square), and four with indefinite quantifiers (e.g., a lot of orange, so many strawberry) but does not mark the plural agreement. Such structural results, together with the richer vocabulary shown at their pre-test, exhibit a livelier situation with K2 compared to K1 children, which somehow accounts for the extra two semesters of instruction in English received by K2 children before DMFonF. In fact, half of the K2 children are on the verge of crossing the stage barrier (as against two in K1). Thus, in terms of PT, all children in K2 were assessed at the single word stage (Stage 1), like the K1 children, because they produced no systematic grammatical marking on any category.
5.3.2 Plural production results at post-test

Tables 24 and 25 below present the post-test results of grammatical forms in K1 and K2 at Time 2. The post-test was conducted after one semester of English L2 instruction with DMFonF.

Table 24. K1: Grammatical forms results in PT stages at Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage/Informant</th>
<th>Zah</th>
<th>Kia</th>
<th>Niz</th>
<th>Fap</th>
<th>Sha</th>
<th>Teo</th>
<th>Pan</th>
<th>Hal</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Kin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. NP plural agreement</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>(+2)-3</td>
<td>+2.9</td>
<td>+6.5-4</td>
<td>+6.1</td>
<td>+15-1</td>
<td>+13-1</td>
<td>+12.3</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lexical plural -s</td>
<td>+32-3</td>
<td>+13-8&gt;3</td>
<td>+9-8&gt;2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+8.9</td>
<td>+6-1&gt;1</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+7.2</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single word</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 24, after implementing the DMFonF program for three months, all children in K1 attained the lexical plural stage (Stage 2). Nine out of 10 children also attained the phrasal plural agreement stage (Stage 3). Curiously enough, Kin, the most advanced of the group, produced no contexts for lexical plural (Stage 2). This may be due to a lack of context at the post-test. However, it is clear from recorded classroom data that the teacher produced plenty of lexical plurals as in the examples (2a-c) from the first K1 classroom recording session.

(2) a. T uh . Kin apples (Teacher shows a card with many red apples)
       Kin

b. T OK Kin strawberries (T shows a card with many red strawberries)
       Kin

c. T OK good . Kin bananas (T shows a card with many yellow bananas)
       Kin
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At post-test, Kin always produces a definite (e.g., *four colourful books*) or indefinite quantifier (e.g., *a lot of mangoes* and *lots of red tomatoes*) with all her 24 nominals, always marking plural agreement and often adding adjectives as well. Indeed, Kin is the only K1 child who produces indefinite quantifiers in her noun phrases. All K1 children, with two exceptions, also produce phrasal agreement in sufficient quantity and variation to satisfy the emergence criterion. For instance, Pan at pre-test does not produce lexical nor phrasal plural marking while at the post-test he produces nine lexical plurals (e.g., *bags, red strawberries*), 13 noun phrases with the plural agreement, including 12 instances with numeral+adjective+noun (e.g., *four blue triangles, two red apples*). Only Zah does not produce any phrasal stage constructions but she becomes able to handle lexical plural with a high accuracy rate, i.e., 32 instances out of 36 plural contexts. It is worthwhile noting that five children oversupply -s on nouns in singular contexts in either lexical or phrasal contexts (e.g., *white horses* to refer to one white horse, *one monkeys, one white ducks*).

Kia produces five contexts for the phrasal plural with two positive agreements and three without agreement, however, her phrasal production is not clear. The doubts about whether the emergence criterion is satisfied arise from the minimal variation in the two adjacent phrases where the agreement seemed to occur (*two bags* referring to 12 bags and *two ducks* referring to five ducks). The word *two* is the only numeral Kia ever uses, including in phrases without agreement, and regardless of the actual number of items. For example, *two blue bag* to refer to two blue bags, *two monkey* to refer to two monkeys, *two pencil* to refer to five pencils, thus appearing to use ‘two’ as a kind of generic classifier for multiple tokens of the same entity. A similar phenomenon occurs during development in English L1 children. In Brown’s study, for instance, Adam, Eve and Sarah use the numeral *two* “to refer to more than one instance though
not always just two” (Brown, 1973, p. 331). The association of plural concept with the morpheme -s is, however, well established in Kia as she produces 13 cases of lexical plural (as Table 23 shows). The issue is whether Kia systematically achieves phrasal plural agreement, and here the evidence is weak. Prompted by the researcher to count, Kia does so but in Indonesian and responds with a lexical plural (bags, ducks). Kia does produce further contexts for phrasal agreement, as in the examples just above, but without marking the noun with the plural morpheme.

The next tables are the post-test results of K2. It can be seen from Table 25 that, after 12 weeks of instruction with DMFonF, all children in K2 are able to produce lexical and phrasal plural agreement in the NP except for Aqa who produces lexical but not phrasal plural.
Table 25. K2: Grammatical forms results in PT stages at Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage/Informant</th>
<th>Aqa</th>
<th>Fah</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Dan</th>
<th>Far</th>
<th>Que</th>
<th>Aqj</th>
<th>Raf</th>
<th>Vit</th>
<th>Zai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. NP plural agreement</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>7-1 &gt; 1</td>
<td>+13-1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+12-2 &gt; 1</td>
<td>+18-2</td>
<td>+17-3</td>
<td>+14-1 &gt; 1</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>+16 &gt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lexical plural -s</td>
<td>+3-14 &gt; 1</td>
<td>+10-2</td>
<td>+9-1</td>
<td>+21-3 &gt; 3</td>
<td>+2-4 &gt; 1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2-3</td>
<td>+11-3</td>
<td>+11-2</td>
<td>+4-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single word</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two children (Aqa and Far) oversupply -s in lexical singular contexts (e.g., *hearts; red tomatoes*; referring to single entities), and one child (Zai) oversupplies -s with phrasal agreement (e.g., *one black pencils*) as in example (3) and (4).

(3) R       yes good. what is this?
  Zai       *one black pencils*

(4) R       I am fine too, thank you. OK speak loudly.
yang keras ya bicaranya ya.
  loudly —— speak
  ‘speak loudly’.

OK today we are going to play with cards.
please answer my question in English ya.
jawabnya dalam Bahasa Inggris ya
answer —— in English.
  ‘answer in English’.

OK what is this?

Far       em, *red tomatoes*
R          OK and what is this?
Far       *one white horses*

The advantage of a year of instruction of K2 manifested itself in a stronger performance at the higher level of phrasal agreement than the K1 group. In fact, nine children out of 10 produced phrasal level operations, most of them confidently (i.e., more than the bare emergence criteria) as against eight children in K1. Also, three of
them, Far, Que and Aqi, managed this agreement with both definite (numerical) and indefinite quantifiers, (e.g., a lot of carrots, a lot of yellow bananas), which is a step higher within the stage, as against only Kin in the K1 group. In terms of PT stages, all K2 children at Time 2 attained the lexical stage (Stage 2) and nine out of 10 children attained the phrasal plural stage (Stage 3).

The number of children who oversupplied -s on nouns in K1 was much higher than in K2. This seems to be a developmental error since over suppliance of -s on nouns in singular contexts was reported in other child L2 studies such as Yamaguchi (2010) and Jia (2003). Overall, the K1 and K2 results at post-test are consistent with the PT hierarchy and lend support to the Teachability Hypothesis (Pienemann, 1984). The plural acquisition sequence is also consistent with Brown’s (1973) findings in FLA and Di Biase et al. (2015) in SLA.

5.4 The delayed post-test results

This section presents the lexical and grammatical acquisition for K1 and K2 children at delayed post-test, that is, six months after post-test. When delayed post-test (Time 3) was conducted, the K1 children had received a semester of English L2 meaning-based program in the second year after the DMFonF program during the experiment period of kindergarten while the K2 children had graduated from kindergarten and entered Year 1 in primary school. The purpose of conducting the delayed post-test was to ascertain whether the children still retained their lexical items and grammatical structures learned from the DMFonF program after a certain period.
5.4.1 Lexical acquisition at Time 3

Table 26 presents the results of lexical types in K1 at Time 3, that is, six months after the post-test. Eight out of the original 10 children in K1 participated in delayed post-test as two had moved to other schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Informant</th>
<th>Total lexical types</th>
<th>Zeh</th>
<th>Niz</th>
<th>Fap</th>
<th>Sha</th>
<th>Tsa</th>
<th>Hai</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Kin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copulas</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite quantifiers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite quantifiers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstratives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total types</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 26, the K1 children can produce between 29 to 46 lexical items at delayed post-test. All eight children in K1 produce nouns, adjectives, definite quantifiers, and formulas at Time 3. Compared to their production of lexical types at Time 2/post-test (see Table 16), their lexical types at Time 3 had dropped significantly.
For example, Kin, the most advanced child in K1, produces only 38 lexical types at Time 3 while she produces 64 lexical types at T2. Her lexical types production had dropped 25% compared to her lexical types production at Time 2. While Zah does not produce definite or indefinite quantifiers at Time 2, surprisingly at Time 3, she produces definite quantifiers (e.g., one, two, three and five) four times and indefinite quantifiers (e.g., a lot of and many) two times. Zah produces 46 lexical types at Time 3, which is the greatest number among the K1 children.

Next, Table 27 presents the results of lexical types in K2 at Time 3. In K2 group, seven of the original 10 children participated in delayed post-test. These children had already graduated from the kindergarten and three could not be contacted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Informant</th>
<th>Total lexical types</th>
<th>Fah</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Dan</th>
<th>Que</th>
<th>Aqi</th>
<th>Vit</th>
<th>Zai</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>chicken, apples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>want, to play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copulas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>am, is, are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>white, green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>i, you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite quantifiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstratives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total types</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be seen from Table 27 that the K2 children were able to produce between 18 to 67 lexical types at T3. All seven children in K2 produce nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and definite quantifiers at Time 3 except for Dan who only produces nouns. None of the children in K2 produce indefinite quantifiers at Time 3. Three children produce more lexical items at Time 3 than at Time 2 (Jan, Aqi, Fah). The other four children produce fewer lexical items (Que, Dan, Vit, Zai). For example, Dan can produce adjectives and definite quantifiers at Time 2, but at Time 3, he does not produce both adjectives and definite quantifiers. He only produces 18 lexical types that drop to 38% at Time 3 as compared to his lexical types production at Time 2 (i.e., 40). His lexical types production at Time 3 represent the least number among the K2 children.

In summary, six months after the post-test, the children in K1 and K2 demonstrate varying levels of lexical development. Some have maintained their lexical types of production, but some have not. This may be because the children in both groups did not receive any input on lexical or grammatical learning, particularly in plural contexts or there was no English stimulus from their linguistic environment. This means that the DMFonF program had a significant effect on the children’s lexical development, but the English program had to continue to provide English input to promote and maintain children’s lexical growth.

5.4.2 Grammatical acquisition at Time 3

Tables 28 and 29 present the results of noun phrase structures produced by K1 and K2 children at Time 3.
Table 28. K1: Noun phrase structures production at Time 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun phrase structure</th>
<th>Zah</th>
<th>Niz</th>
<th>Fap</th>
<th>Sha</th>
<th>Tsa</th>
<th>Hai</th>
<th>Dac</th>
<th>Kin</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adjective+noun</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white ducks, orange carrots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective+article+ noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yellow a bananas, red a strawberries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective+numeral+noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>red two apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite quantifier+noun</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one dog, two apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite quantifier+adjective+noun</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>three yellow pumpkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite quantifier+noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a lot of cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite quantifier+adjective+noun</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a lot of blue triangle (in singular context), many red roses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29. K2: Noun phrase structures production at Time 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun phrase structure</th>
<th>Fah</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Dan</th>
<th>Que</th>
<th>Aqi</th>
<th>Vit</th>
<th>Zai</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adjective+noun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yellow bananas, brown dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun+adjective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>flower red, triangles blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite quantifier+noun</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one mango, four duck, fifteen stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite quantifier+adjective+noun</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one green triangle, three white horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite quantifier+definite article+noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>two the mangoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective+definite quantifier+noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yellow eleven cars, brown four dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite quantifier+noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eight bags red, one cow white</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six months after the post-test at Time 3, K1 and K2 children maintained their noun phrase production, except for Dan from K2, who only produced single nouns. However, some children produced noun phrase structures in the wrong order. For
instance, like Zai from K2 at Time 1, Jan and Que from K2 at Time 3 respectively produced plural NPs with the noun placed before the adjective as in triangles blue and flower red instead of blue triangles and red flowers. They also produced NP with definite quantifier+noun first, then adjective as in eight bags red and one cow white. These shreds of evidence may be from the Indonesian NP structure consisting of (definite quantifier) +noun+adjective as their L1. Fap in K1 and Jan in K2 respectively produced plural NPs with the adjective placed before the definite quantifier followed by the noun as a head such as red two apple, yellow eleven cars instead of two red apples and eleven yellow cars.

As shown in Table 28, Zah from K1 at Time 1 and Time 2 is not able to produce plural noun phrases, surprisingly at Time 3, she produces various nominal syntactic constructions with noun heads accompanied by definite quantifier and adjective (e.g., two red apples, two green mangos) and indefinite quantifier and/or adjective (e.g., a lot of cat, many yellow cars, a lot of red strawberries). Dac at Time 3 produces lexical plural NP two times with the singular indefinite article ‘a’ placed before the noun, for example, yellow a bananas and red a strawberries. Dac tries to use indefinite article in the NP as he received this lesson in the classroom; however, he cannot differentiate the use of the article for singular and plural contexts.

Mixed lexical and phrasal forms in the NP also appeared at Time 3 in two children, Niz from K1 and Que from K2. Niz produces NP with English adjective followed by Indonesian noun in singular context such as orange jeruk (jeruk in Indonesian means orange in English). Que produces phrasal plural with English definite quantifier+adjective followed by Indonesian noun, for example, five orange wortel (wortel in Indonesian means carrot in English). Similar patterns were found in
a Malay-English bilingual child case study (Mohamed Salleh et al., 2016; Mohamed Salleh, 2017).

Dac from K1 at Time 3 produces a declarative sentence ‘this is green mangos’ in plural context. He is able to produce the sentence with the verb to be, however, he uses the copula ‘is’ for singular context instead of ‘are’ for plural context. He uses singular demonstrative ‘this’ instead of ‘these’ to refer to plural context. A subject and a verb in the sentence do not agree for plural context. He successfully produces lexical plural ‘green mangos’ as an object in the sentence.

Zai from K2 at Time 3 also produces some English declarative sentences with the verb to be in the plural contexts. Zai successfully produces two sentences with the verb to be in singular contexts (e.g., this is green triangle, and this is one green mango). However, Zai oversupplies morpheme -s on noun in singular context (e.g., this is red books) and on copula are two times in phrasal plural contexts (e.g., this ares blue bags and this ares yellow cars). For the third time, Zai finally produces copula ‘are’ and demonstrative ‘this’ but the Subject and Verb do not agree as she produces this are four white ducks. Interestingly, she can identify the verb ‘to be’ for a plural object even though she cannot differentiate the use of demonstratives this and these as Subject. This probably means the pronunciation of these demonstratives looks similar.

In these two examples, Dac and Zai can apply demonstrative ‘this’ in their sentence production because they had learned English articles and demonstratives during the meaning based English L2 program in the first semester of the second year of kindergarten. Note that Zai repeated one more year in the kindergarten, thus, Zai and Dac were in the same classroom.
5.4.3 Plural production results at delayed post-test

Table 30 presents the delayed post-test results of grammatical forms in K1 at Time 3. The K1 children continued their English L2 meaning-based program with the same teacher in the second year of kindergarten.

Table 30. K1: Grammatical forms results in PT stages at Time 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage/Informant</th>
<th>Niz</th>
<th>Doc</th>
<th>Sha</th>
<th>Fap</th>
<th>Tsa</th>
<th>Hal</th>
<th>Kin</th>
<th>Zah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. NP plural agreement</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+3&gt;1</td>
<td>+2&gt;2</td>
<td>+3&gt;1</td>
<td>+9&gt;3</td>
<td>+10&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lexical plural -s</td>
<td>(+2)&gt;5</td>
<td>+9&gt;3&gt;2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+5&gt;3</td>
<td>+4&gt;1&gt;1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single word</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 30, six of the eight K1 children at Time 3 attained the third (phrasal plural) stage. Three of them (Zah, Hai, Kin) do not produce lexical plurals (i.e., plural morphology -s is added to the noun without any modifiers) during the delayed post-test but only phrasal plurals. Interestingly, Kin consistently produces phrasal plural agreement with definite and indefinite quantifiers at Time 2 and Time 3 such as *four blue squares* and *a lot of orange carrots*. Zah at Time 2 only produces lexical plural. However, at Time 3, Zah can produce NP plural agreement with definite quantifiers three times and indefinite quantifiers seven times. For example, Zah produces *two red apples, many brown dogs, and a lot of yellow bananas*.

Sha at Time 2 can produce lexical and phrasal plural marking. However, at Time 3, she produces lexical plural contexts three times but fails to mark plural -s on nouns. Interestingly, she successfully produces phrasal plural agreement with numeric quantifiers three times at Time 3. In terms of PT stages, Sha is at the third stage.
Niz at Time 2 can produce lexical and phrasal plural. Unfortunately, at Time 3, he only produces the same instances of lexical plural twice (e.g., *orange carrots*), which do not satisfy the emergence criterion. He fails to mark plural *-s* on nouns six times in lexical plural contexts and two times in phrasal plural contexts as in the example (5) below.

(5) R OK good and next, what are these?
    Niz *two cow*
    R OK and what are these?
    Niz *orange carrots*

Dac at Time 2 can produce phrasal plural agreement, unfortunately, at Time 3 (see Table 30) he only produces lexical plural. He can produce phrasal form in singular context such as *one yellow banana* and he produced NP with indefinite quantifier ‘a lot of’ for plural context but he misuses in singular context, e.g., *a lot of blue triangle*. He also oversupplies plural marking *-s* on nouns in singular contexts two times (e.g., *orange oranges* and *blue squares*). In terms of PT stages, Niz attains the first (single word) stage and Dac the second (lexical plural) stage at Time 3.

The following Table 31 presents the delayed post-test results of grammatical forms in K2 at Time 3. All K2 children had still received the English L2 program as a local content once a week in their Year 1 in primary school. Recall, Zai was the only child who repeated her second year of kindergarten in the same school.

**Table 31. K2: Grammatical forms results in PT stages at Time 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage/ Informant</th>
<th>Dan</th>
<th>Aqi</th>
<th>Fah</th>
<th>Vit</th>
<th>Zai</th>
<th>Que</th>
<th>Jan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. NP plural agreement</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>(+1)-4&gt;1</td>
<td>+3.8</td>
<td>+3&gt;1</td>
<td>+6-2&gt;9</td>
<td>+9-3&gt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lexical plural <em>-s</em></td>
<td>(+4)-12&gt;2</td>
<td>(+2)-22&gt;1</td>
<td>+3-7&gt;1</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>+5-1&gt;1</td>
<td>+9-5&gt;1</td>
<td>+3-8&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single word</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As can be seen from Table 31, four (Vit, Zai, Que and Jan) out of seven children attain the phrasal plural stage at Time 3. Fah is the only child who is at the second (lexical plural) stage. The other two children (Dan and Aqi) are still at the single word stage.

Jan and Zai consistently produce phrasal plural agreement with definite quantifiers at Time 2 (see Table 25) and Time 3 such as *four dogs* and *five green carrots*. Que at Time 2 can produce phrasal plural agreement with indefinite quantifiers, however, at Time 3 she only produces phrasal agreement with definite quantifiers. Vit at Time 2 can produce lexical plural, however, at Time 3 she produces lexical plural contexts 11 times but fails to mark plural -s on nouns. Interestingly, Vita can produce phrasal plural agreement three times with definite quantifiers. Dan and Fah at Time 2 can produce phrasal plural agreement with definite quantifiers. However, at Time 3, Dac only produces lexical plural with single nouns (e.g., *stars* three times and *cars* one time) and Fah produces phrasal plural agreement with definite quantifier only once, which does not satisfy the emergence criterion. Aqi at Time 2 can produce phrasal plural agreement with definite and indefinite quantifiers. Unfortunately, at Time 3, he produces phrasal plural contexts eight times but fails to mark plural -s on nouns such as *four duck* and *ten bag*.

In summary, the results of the delayed post-test cross-sectionally show an interesting pattern. Some children can produce phrasal but not lexical plural marking. However, this does not reflect their longitudinal developmental sequence since all of them had already acquired the lexical plural earlier. Five out of eight children in K1 and six out of seven children in K2 did oversupply -s on nouns in singular contexts either lexical or phrasal at Time 3. The cross-sectional results may skew the picture and lead to misinterpretation of children’s truly acquisitional patterns. Results from
this study align with other studies of English L2 and with other languages (e.g., Spanish, Italian). The results suggest that PT’s original developmental sequence is well supported and can be profitably applied in L2 instruction programs.

5.5 Implicational scaling in K1 and K2

In Processability Theory (Pienemann, 1998), a particular structure is acquired when learners produce the lexicon that satisfies the emergence criterion in the data. To determine the developmental stages, implicational scaling is needed in this study. Table 32 shows the implicational scaling in K1 and K2 combined at the pre-test and Table 33 at the post-test, respectively. The sign ‘+’ means a particular structure is acquired by the child while the sign ‘-’ means not acquired. The ‘(+)’ sign shows that a particular structure is supplied without lexical and/or formal variation at the point in time. The sign ‘/’ means there are no lexical or phrasal plural contexts.

Tables 32 and 33 do not contain a single contradiction of the hypothesised implicational pattern. This means the scalability of the tables is 100%, and the implicational relationship of grammatical forms contained in the tables is valid (Pienemann, 2011).
Table 32. Implicational summary of K1 and K2 grammatical development before implementing the DM FonF program (Time 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phrasal plural with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quantifiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phrasal plural with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>numeric quantifiers</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lexical plural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Single words</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from Table 32, all children in K1 and K2 were at the earliest stage of language development, i.e., the Single Word stage without any grammatical marking. There were six children, two from K1 (Niz and Kin) and four from K2 (Fah, Que, Far and Zai), who produced lexical plural marking -s on nouns, however, their lexical plural production did not satisfy the emergence criterion for Stage 2. Among the K1 children, except for Kin, there was no evidence manifesting phrasal development. The next, the Categorial stage, which allows learners to differentiate, and string together, nouns, adjectives or verbs was not yet in place.

Two K2 children (Jan and Zai) were able to produce noun phrases consisting of nouns and modifiers. Jan, for instance, produced an adjective followed by a noun such as yellow banana (referring to a bunch of bananas) without the plural marker -s on the noun. Interestingly, Zai was also able to produce phrasal agreement contexts with indefinite and definite quantifiers with nouns (e.g., a lot of orange, so many elephant, ten square) but did not mark plurality.

After three months with DMFonF instruction, at the post-test (Time 2), all children in K1 and K2 attained the second (lexical plural) stage, and 17 out of 20 children attained the third (phrasal plural agreement) stage as shown in Table 33. There were four children, one from K1 (Kin) and three from K2 (Aqi, Far, Que), who were able to produce phrasal plural agreement with indefinite quantifiers.
Table 33. Implicational summary of K1 and K2 grammatical development after three months with the DMFonF program (Time 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phrasal Plural with</td>
<td>Aqa</td>
<td>Zah</td>
<td>Kia</td>
<td>Vit</td>
<td>Raf</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Tsa</td>
<td>Sha</td>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>Hai</td>
<td>Fap</td>
<td>Dac</td>
<td>Fah</td>
<td>Niz</td>
<td>Zai</td>
<td>Que</td>
<td>Far</td>
<td>Aqi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quantifiers</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lexical plural</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Single words</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings at Time 1 and Time 2 are consistent with Brown’s study on English L1 (1973) and BFLA studies involving a Japanese-English child (Itani-Adams, 2007) and a Malay-English child (Mohamed Salleh, 2017), as well as child SLA involving a Japanese child learning English (Yamaguchi, 2010; Di Biase et al., 2015) and English L1 primary school children learning Italian (Di Biase, 2002, 2008). This suggests that the results in this study support the developmental sequence of plural marker -s on nouns and NP plural agreement in English L2 acquisition of the Indonesian kindergarten children is compatible with the sequence predicted in PT.

The following table shows the implicational summary at the delayed post-test at Time 3 in K1 and K2 that is, six months after the post-test. Since there was two contradictory evidence to the sequence in this study, the coefficient of scalability in Table 33 is 96.67%. According to Hatch & Lazaraton (1991, p. 210), the coefficient of scalability should be over 90% before an implicational analysis can be considered valid.
Table 34. Implicational summary of K1 and K2 grammatical development at the delayed post-test (Time 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
<th>K1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Niz</td>
<td>Aqi</td>
<td>Dac</td>
<td>Fah</td>
<td>Sha</td>
<td>Vlt</td>
<td>Fap</td>
<td>Tsa</td>
<td>Zal</td>
<td>Que</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>Kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phrasal Plural with indefinite quantity</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phrasal Plural with numeric quantity</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lexical plural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Single words</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As shown in Table 34, 15 out of 20 children participated in the delayed post-test, six months after the post-test. In terms of PT stages, three children, Dan, Niz, and Aqi, were still at the single word stage (Stage 1), two children, Dac and Fah, at the lexical plural stage (Stage 2), and the remaining 10 children at the phrasal plural stage (Stage 3). The results from the delayed post-test suggest then that most of what the K1 children acquired about English lexical and phrasal plural could be retained over the medium to long-term by six out of eight children. However, out of seven K2 children who participated in the delayed post-test only four retained their knowledge of English lexical and phrasal plural marking at Time 3.

In summary, these results indicate that the DMFonF program is effective for language development. In terms of PT, lexical plural emerges before phrasal plural in English L2. Within phrasal plural, a plural agreement between numeric quantifier and noun is acquired before other quantifiers and nouns. In the next section, the teacher’s linguistic behaviour before and during the DMFonF program is provided.

5.6 Teacher’s linguistic input, interaction, and feedback

This section focuses on the teacher’s linguistic behaviour and especially on feedback while delivering the English L2 program before and during the implementation of the DMFonF intervention. The purpose of analysing the teacher’s linguistic behaviour in the classroom is to identify possible reasons for the effect of the DMFonF program in relation to lexical, noun phrase, and plural acquisition by evaluating the quality of English exposure in the kindergarten classroom. This current study uses the teacher’s linguistic behaviour categories based on Di Biase (2002). The detailed explanations of the categories have been provided in Chapter 4 Subsection 4.4.4.
5.6.1 Teacher’s linguistic feedback before implementing the DMFonF program

Before implementing the DMFonF program, children had learned through communicative meaning-based instruction, which focuses on English expression and vocabulary learning. The meaning-based classes involved some activities, including singing songs, storytelling, and playing games.

Four partial video recordings were employed when the teacher implemented the meaning-based program in the classroom. The duration of video recordings was around 20-25 minutes.

Table 35 shows the teacher’s linguistic behaviour before applying the DMFonF program. The left column lists the behaviour code categories used by the teacher. The middle column explains the code categories and the right column indicates the frequency of the teacher’s linguistic behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Teacher’s Linguistic Feedback in Class</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Asks Question</td>
<td>84 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>No Correction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+FB</td>
<td>Positive Feedback (+form)</td>
<td>21 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Request Repetition (individual or choral)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{R</td>
<td>Recast (+stress)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM+</td>
<td>Provides form (+in FonF schedule)</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{RW (+)</td>
<td>Repeat wrong form (stress)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{CL</td>
<td>Clarification Request (what)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (+)</td>
<td>Teacher’s explicit correction (+form/EXPL) (NOT this but THAT)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other input enhancement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{EX</td>
<td>Explanation Request (why)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 35, the teacher used six of the 12 categories during the meaning-based program, namely asks questions (Q), positive feedback (+FB), request repetition (RR), verbal CUE, provide form (FORM+), and explicit correction (EC (+))). The most frequently used category was ‘asks questions’ (Q). In the four sessions observed, the teacher asked 84 questions consisting of 46 to a specific child and 38 to the wider class. In example (6), the teacher asked a child a question related to the lesson topic that is ‘emotion’.

(6) T OK, Vit how do you feel today? {Q}  
Vit I am happy Miss

The +FB was the second most frequently used category by the teacher. The teacher gave positive feedback without form, which was equivalent to explicit approval and this happened 21 times, for example, OK and good. The teacher gave 12 positive feedback comments in the first lesson, five in the second lesson, and one in the third lesson, and three in the fourth lesson. Example (7) below shows the teacher gave positive feedback comments to a child.

(7) T ini colour  
Dan ‘this’ purple  
T good . and now {+FB} what is the colour of your uniform? uniform {Q}  
Aqi yellow

The third frequently used feedback category was RR. The teacher asked a child or a group of children to repeat the correct production three times in the meaning-based program. The teacher did RR (Request Repetition) two times in the first lesson and once in the second lesson to a specific child as in example (8) below.

(8) all children he is farmer  
T OK repeat after me . he is {RR} {verbal CUE}  
Que he is farmer
The fourth frequently used feedback category was verbal CUE. The teacher provided verbal cues five times in total, once in the first and in the third lesson, and three times in the fourth lesson. For example, the teacher provided a syntactic form without the ending, “I feel …” and “he is …” as in examples (9) and (10) below.

(9) T I feel {verbal CUE}  
     Raf I feel happy

(10) T OK repeat after me. he is {RR} {verbal CUE}  
     Zai he is farmer

The fifth feedback category was +FORM. The teacher provided a new form to the children. This happened seven times in total, four times in the second session and three times in the fourth session. Examples (11) and (12) show the teacher provided new forms in a word (e.g., rooster) and a sentence (e.g., the sun rises) to the children.

(11) T what the picture? what is it? {Q}  
     (the teacher points at one of the pictures in the book)  
     Dan the sun  
     T rooster. OK and kira kira ini lagi apa ya {+FORM}  
          “what else?”

(12) T good morning to you  
     all children good morning my dear friends, good morning to you  
     T kok teman teman bisa tahu ini tu lagi morning  
          “how do you know this is morning?”  
     all children taulah kan ada  
          “just know because”  
     T because ada apanya? ada.  
          “because of what? there is”  
     all children panas eh  
          “hot”  
     T ada mataharinya baru ter ...  
          “the sun ri...”  
     all children bit  
          “.. se”  
     T the sun rises. kira kira the rooster mau ngapain ya?  
          “what do you think the rooster is doing?”
The feedback category was EC (+)} (Explicit Correction). The teacher provided explicit correction two times (once in the first and once in the second lesson) but she did not provide the correct forms as in examples (13) and (14) below.

(13) T and then what it is? OK. ehm ...

Aqa surprise

T it is not surprise

(14) T karena ada. apanya?

“because of what?”

Que bulan

“moon”

T In English

Far bulan

“moon”

T no no no. bulan itu dalam bahasa Inggris apa?

“what is moon in English?”

Besides the four feedback categories mentioned above, the teacher also gave general feedback to the children. For example, the teacher sometimes corrected the children’s pronunciation by asking them to repeat certain words. There were some categories, which did not occur in the meaning-based classes. These are: NC (No Correction), R (Recast), RW (+) (Repeat wrong forms), CL (Clarification request), O (Other input enhancement) and EX (Explanation request).

In summary, the teacher used half of the linguistic behaviour categories in the meaning-based classroom. The highest category was Q and the second-highest category was +FB. The teacher did not teach in terms of form, but she only taught in terms of meaning.
5.6.2 Teacher’s linguistic behaviour during the implementation of DMFonF program

The teacher’s linguistic behaviour was observed through six sessions of video recordings per group with 12 recordings in total. Each session lasted between 20 and 25 minutes. To maintain consistent quality in implementing the DMFonF program (Di Biase, 2002), the researcher organised meetings with the teacher at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the 12-week DMFonF program for both K1 and K2. The analysis of the teacher’s linguistic feedback on both groups is presented below.

Tables 36 and 37 present the teacher’s linguistic behaviour during the implementation of the DMFonF program in K1 and K2. Some types of feedback increased and/or decreased over the DMFonF instruction period. The highest categories of feedback in each session are highlighted in grey.

Table 36. Teacher’s linguistic behaviour in the DMFonF program in K1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Teacher’s linguistic behaviour in class</th>
<th>K1 Group Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Asks Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>No Correction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+FB</td>
<td>Positive Feedback (+form) Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Repetition (individual or choral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recast (+stress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>Verbal Provides form (+in DMFonF schedule)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM+</td>
<td>Repeat wrong form (+stress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Clarification Request (what)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 4</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
<th>Session 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 (38%)</td>
<td>66 (41%)</td>
<td>23 (29%)</td>
<td>61 (31%)</td>
<td>18 (17%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (10%)</td>
<td>16 (10%)</td>
<td>17 (21%)</td>
<td>25 (15%)</td>
<td>28 (26%)</td>
<td>17 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 (18%)</td>
<td>13 (8%)</td>
<td>9 (11%)</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>6 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 37. Teacher’s linguistic behaviour in the DM FonF program in K2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Teacher’s linguistic behaviour in class</th>
<th>K2 Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Session 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Asks Question</td>
<td>66 (40%)</td>
<td>49 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>No Correction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+FB</td>
<td>Feedback (+form)</td>
<td>45 (31%)</td>
<td>43 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Feedback Request</td>
<td>45 (31%)</td>
<td>43 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Repetition (individual or choral)</td>
<td>23 (20%)</td>
<td>14 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR</td>
<td>Recast (+stress)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>Provides form</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+in DM FonF schedule)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW (+)</td>
<td>Repeat wrong form (stress)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request (what)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (+)</td>
<td>Teacher’s explicit correction</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+form/EXPL) (NOT this but THAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other input enhancement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Explanation Request (why)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of 12 possible categories of linguistic behaviour, the teacher used nine categories in K1 and K2 over the three months of delivering DM FonF instruction. The highest categories in each session in K1 and K2 were similar, i.e., Q and +FB, except for session 3 in K2, i.e., RR.

1. **Q: Asks Question**

The teacher used the Q category in six sessions in K1 and K2. In the K1 sessions, the teacher asked a total of 221 questions (Q) consisting of 133 for individual child and 88 for all the children. The questions included: *What is this? What are these?* The teacher tended to ask questions during earlier sessions and reduced the questions in the later sessions. The Q category had the highest percentages of category in Sessions 1 to 3. The teacher asked 50 questions (38%) in Session 1 and 66 questions (41%) in Session 2, which decreased throughout the following sessions, e.g., three questions in Session 6 (4%).

In the K2 sessions, the teacher asked a total of 188 questions in six sessions in K2, including 92 to a child and 96 to all children as in examples (15) and (16). Like K1, the Q category was the highest feedback type in both Sessions 1 and 2. The teacher asked 66 questions (40%) in Session 1 and 49 questions (44%) in Session 2. The Q category again decreased in the later sessions such as two questions in Session 6 (4%).

(15) T
Fakh
T
Aqi

ah Fakh what is this? strawberry
OK good, Aqi what is this? strawberry

(16) T
all children
T

what are these? apples apples
good

{Q} {Q} {+FB}
The teacher sometimes asked questions using nonverbal communication from Sessions 2 to 6 in K1 and all sessions in K2. For example, the teacher showed a card to the children without saying anything and pointed at a picture card. The teacher used many nonverbal questions in the last three sessions in both groups. This indicates the teacher tried to draw the child’s attention to focus on the picture card and this could elicit interest in the bored children (Bambaeroo & Shokrpour, 2017). She also sometimes asked questions using Indonesian and mixed utterances (Indonesian and English). The dominance of feedback suggests the teacher used the Q category to elicit the children’s language production and to check children’s understanding of the forms being taught (Nunan & Lamb, 1996).

2.  

+FB: Positive Feedback (+form)

The teacher gave positive feedback in six lessons observed in K1 and K2. In K1, the positive feedback (+FB) category was frequent, being evident over 20% of each lesson throughout the DMFonF program. The teacher used positive feedback without form, which equated to explicit approval such as OK, good, excellent; she also used positive feedback by repeating forms. The +FB category was the highest feedback type in three consecutive sessions in K1 (Session 3=28%, Session 4=45%, and Session 5=46%). In the six lessons observed, the teacher gave positive feedback 276 times consisting of 20 times with the correct form and 256 without form.

In K2 across six lessons, the teacher gave positive feedback a total of 232 times consisting of 15 times with the correct form and 217 without form. This category was the highest feedback type in the last three sessions (45%, 46%, 44%). Examples (17) and (18) show the teacher provided positive feedback without form and with the form to a specific child.
(17) T Kin what are these? [Q]
   Kin bananas
   T OK good, what is this? [+FB] [Q]

(18) T Zai what is that? [Q]
   Zai orange carrot
   T good orange carrot. [+FB +form]
   next Zai, please take four hearts

The +FB category can enhance children’s learning and self-efficacy (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). Using +FB helped the teacher to consolidate the form and acknowledge the correct form when the children produced it.

3. **RR: Request Repetition (individual/choral)**

Request repetition (RR) category means simply asking a child or children to repeat what they said. The teacher used the RR (individual/choral) feedback category more in K2 than in K1. It was distributed in all six sessions in K1 and K2.

In K1, the RR type of feedback gradually increased in the first to fourth sessions and decreased in the last two sessions over the DMFonF period. In Session 1, for example, the teacher gave RR 13 times (10%) making RR the fourth most frequently used feedback strategy in the session, after Q (38%), +FB (25%), and {R (18%). The number of RR per lesson nearly double in Sessions 4 (29 times) and 5 (28 times). Overall, the teacher asked a child 56 times, and a group 64 times in K1 to repeat (correct) production with a total of 120 times.

In K2, the teacher used RR category a total of 140 times consisting of 69 times to a child and 71 times to a group across the six sessions. In K2, the number of RR per lesson fluctuated. The greatest number of RR was 39 times in the fifth session, while the least number of RR was 14 times in the second session. However, this category became the highest feedback type in Session 3 (40%).
The following examples (19) and (20) provide the RR category in the L2 classroom.

(19) T these are (Teacher shows a card with many red apples)
    all children apple {Q}
    T no, repeat after me. apples {EC} {RR}+form
    all children apples

(20) T OK Zai. (T shows a card with many red apples)
    Zai red apple {RR}
    T repeat again
    Zai red apples

In example (19), all children in K1 answered the wrong form when the teacher asked them the plural form of ‘apple’. The teacher first provided an explicit correction (EC) by saying ‘no’. Then, she provided the correct form ‘apples’ by asking the children to repeat what she said. The children responded to the teacher’s request and imitated the teacher’s correction.

Example (20) shows that the child (Zai) produced the singular form when the teacher showed Zai a card with many red apples. The teacher asked Zai to reproduce her utterance. Zai realised that she had made an error and she added the suffix -s on the noun.

The teacher asked the child or group to repeat (correct) production to consolidate the children to memorise correctly. Repetition has historically been related to audiolingual method (see Chapter 3 Section 3.1.1). Thus, the effect of RR the teacher used in DMFonF provides opportunities for the learners to self-correction (Nassaji, 2015). Repetition can also act as a part of negotiation of meaning in the implicit corrective feedback categories which facilitate acquisition (Long, 1996). Repetition
emphasises linguistic problems and draws learners’ attention to focus on form during communicative interactions (Long, 1991, 1996; Nassaji, 2015).

4. *Recast*

The teacher used simple recast (without stress) as a form of corrective feedback (implicit correction) more in K1 than in K2. The teacher correctly recast a form that the children produced with some formal error. The recast may have been limited to the wrong word or even just an ending.

In K1, the teacher used simple recast approximately 58 times across the five lessons. The recast was frequently used during Session 1 (23 times, 18%) and gradually decreased in Session 2 (13 times, 8%) and Session 3 (9 times, 11%). This category increased again in Session 4 (12 times, 6%) and it decreased dramatically in Session 5 (1 time, 1%). The teacher did not use this category in Session 6.

In K2, the teacher used simple recast (without stress) a total of six times in four lessons. The teacher used recast two times in Sessions 1 and 6 and once in Sessions 2 and 4. The teacher did not use recast category in Sessions 3 and 5 at all.

Examples (17) and (18) show the simple recast the teacher used.

(17) T: good. what are these? (Teacher shows a card with many red strawberries) [+FB] [Q]

Dac: strawberry
T: strawberries [R]
Dac: strawberries

(18) Fap: one books
T: one book [R]
Fap: one book

In example (17), the learner (Dac) from K1 made an error when the teacher asked a question about a plural form of strawberry; he produced *strawberry* to refer to the plural form. The teacher provided a simple recast by correcting Dac’s error, i.e.,
strawberries. Dac noticed his production was incorrect; by imitating the teacher’s corrective recast, he produced strawberries as the plural form of strawberry.

Example (18) shows the learner, Fap from K1, made an error by overgeneralising -s on the noun in a singular context in phrasal agreement (e.g., one books to refer to one book). The teacher provided the recast without stress articulating the correct form of the NP agreement in a singular context, i.e., one book. Fap responded to the teacher’s correction by producing the correct form of one book.

The teacher used recast more frequently in K1 than in K2. A possible explanation is because K1 children often made errors when they produced the form being focused on compared to K2 children. The teacher tended to decrease using recast in both groups in the later sessions maybe because the children had produced the correct forms of English plural.

The examples above show how the teacher provided recasts implicitly rather than explicitly, indicating the learners’ production contained an error. The teacher also provided feedback in an unobtrusive way that did not impede the communicative flow in the classroom (Lyster, Saito & Sato, 2013; Nassaji, 2015). This may suggest R feedback category is important for language teaching, which assumes that feedback promotes form-meaning integration (Gass, 2005; Williams, 2005) and facilitates the acquisition for language development (Farrar 1992; Long, 1996).

5. Verbal CUE

The teacher did not use the verbal cues feedback strategy in Sessions 1 and 2 in both K1 and K2. This may be because she was focused on teaching the new forms to the children. The teacher started to use verbal cues feedback from Session 3, and overall, she provided verbal cues in the K1 group 16 times in four sessions. This type
of feedback was less frequently provided by the teacher, as compared with the four types above.

The teacher provided verbal cues once in the third and three times in the fourth lesson in K2. She did not use this category in the two last sessions. Examples (19) presents verbal cues provided by the teacher in K1.

(19) T OK (T teacher shows a picture of three hearts)  
all children three stars {Q nonverbal}  
T no {EC}  
Pan hearts  
T repeat again. three hearts {RR} {verbal cue}  
all children heart. three hearts

Example (19) shows the teacher used verbal cues by providing elements or syntactic form for completion (word or phrase without ending). Children in K1 responded with the wrong answer when the teacher asked a phrasal plural form question by showing a card to them. The teacher provided explicit correction (EC) by saying ‘no’. One of the children (Pan) noticed and responded to the teacher’s EC by producing the correct form of lexical plural, i.e., *hearts*. The teacher, after asking the children to repeat the form, then used verbal cues by providing the first word (definite quantifier, e.g., *three*) of the phrasal plural form. All the K1 children noticed and responded to the teacher’s cue by producing the correct form of lexical plural followed by the phrasal plural form.

The teacher used verbal cues more with K1 than K2 group. This indicates the children in K1 produced more incorrect forms than the children in K2 and the teacher used the feedback type to confirm whether the children understood the forms were being focused or not.
6. **FORM+: provides form (+in DMFonF schedule)**

The teacher provided a new form usually if no one else seemed to know it. The teacher introduced new forms by showing some picture cards and saying them to the class. The new forms presented in the lessons consisted of lexical plural and phrasal plural agreement based on the DMFonF schedule.

In K1, the teacher provided new forms 25 times in the five lessons. The teacher provided the new forms in sessions one to four between two to six times. The teacher did not use this category in Session 5. However, in the last lesson, the teacher provided the new forms 10 times when she taught phrasal plural with indefinite quantifiers using *some* and *a lot of* as presented in examples (20) and (21) below.

\[(20)\] T all children some carrots {FORM+} some carrots

\[(21)\] T all children OK good now. a lot of cats {+FB} {FORM+} a lot of cats

In K2, the teacher provided new forms 23 times in five lessons. The teacher provided a great number of new forms in the third and sixth lesson when she taught about phrasal plural with definite (e.g., *six trucks* and *four hearts*) and indefinite quantifiers (e.g., *some elephants* and *a lot of strawberries*).

When the teacher first introduced the new forms, the children paid attention. The teacher instructed the children to repeat each form as she introduced it. Most of the children repeated the singular and plural forms. However, some children had difficulty pronouncing the forms, thus, the teacher sometimes corrected the children’s pronunciation and repeated the forms.

7. **Negative feedback techniques {RW (+), {CL and EC (+)}**

Negative feedback techniques include {RW (+), {CL, and EC (+)} in Tables 5.22 and 5.23. The teacher used some negative feedback techniques such as repeated
wrong form (RW), clarification request (CL), and explicit correction (EC) in K1 and K2. Taking all these negative feedback strategies together, the teacher provided 33 instances of negative feedback in K1 and 17 in K2 over the DMFonF period.

In K1, the frequency of RW was zero in Sessions 1 to 3 and remained low in the last three sessions (1 time, 3 times, 2 times). The teacher used CL in earlier sessions, i.e., Session 1 (3 times) and 2 (1 time). However, she did not use this feedback type in Sessions 3-5 at all. The teacher sometimes asked for clarification by using nonverbal communication: for example, the teacher moved her head. She used gestures to encourage the children to clarify and to acknowledge when they correctly answered the question. The teacher provided EC (+)} a total of 23 times containing eight with form and 15 without form. The teacher used more EC (+)} in the last session, i.e., six times.

In K2, the teacher repeated the wrong form (RW) only once in the fourth session and asked for clarification (CL) three times in Sessions 2-5 and provided explicit correction (EC) 13 times in five sessions. The teacher engaged in explicit correction and offered explanations five times in the fourth lesson. The teacher also sometimes explicitly corrected the child’s pronunciation.

Examples (22) and (23) demonstrate how the teacher repeated wrong forms based on child production. The teacher said the negative word ‘no’ first then she repeated the wrong form that the child produced.

(22) T repeat again Tsa {RR}
     Tsa one green hearts
     T no no no hearts, repeat again {RW}
     Tsa one green hearts

(23) T OK good. {FB+}
     OK gini ya sekarang ‘well so now’
        so well now
     OK Sha Sha. Sha ssh. Sha
are you ready? Do you remember? \(\{Q\}\)
some some \(\{\text{Verbal Cue}\}\)
Sha some tomatoes
T no tomatoes. \(\{\text{RW}\}\)
tomatoes \textit{sebelah sini} ‘on this side’
\hspace{1cm} side this
some pota ... \(\{\text{Verbal Cue}\}\)
Sha potatoes

The teacher asked a child for clarification by using the word ‘what’ as in the example (24).

(24) T OK Kin what are these? \(\{Q\}\)
Kin apple
T what? \(\{\text{CL}\}\)
Kin a apple

The teacher provided explicit correction and offered the correct forms as in examples (25) and (26) below.

(25) T OK good Dac what are these? \(\{\text{FB+}\} \{Q\}\)
Dac strawberry
T no. Strawberries \(\{\text{EC+form}\}\)
Dac strawberries

(26) all children one books
T no no no. one book \(\{\text{EC+form}\}\)

Negative feedback techniques were provided; however, they were not the teacher’s major strategy to perform the DMFonF program. A possible reason for the teacher using negative feedback techniques infrequently is because she wanted to give more input based on the DMFonF schedule and she did not want to interrupt the communication flow.

In conclusion, during the DMFonF program, the teacher provided the higher usage of Q, +FB, and RR in both K1 and K2. She tended to provide feedback on lexical
plural errors by using \{\textsc{R} and negative feedback techniques such as \{\textsc{RW} (+), \{\textsc{CL}, and \textsc{EC} (+)\} more in \textit{K1} than in \textit{K2}.

5.6 Discussion

This study examines lexical and grammatical development using the DM FonF instruction component focusing on the acquisition of English plural marking \textit{-s} on nouns in lexical and phrasal structures with four-to-six-year-old Indonesian kindergarten children within PT. The first question asks about the effectiveness of the DM FonF intervention in the meaning based English L2 kindergarten program with younger children in an Indonesian multilingual context. The baseline results reveal that the K1 children, who received six months with the meaning based English L2 program, were still at the first (single word) stage in PT. Similarly, the K2 children, who received one-and-a half years of English L2 in the meaning-based program, were also at the first stage.

After one semester with the DM FonF component in their L2 meaning-based program, most children in K1 and K2 did develop significantly in both morphological marking of plural number and developing the grammatical structure of NP. Indeed, eight children in K1 were able to produce phrasal plural agreement with numeral quantifiers (e.g., \textit{two red apples, four books}). One of them, Kin, was able to produce phrasal plural agreement with indefinite quantifiers as well e.g., \textit{a lot of oranges, lots of brown dogs}. In this group, only Zah and Kia did not attain the phrasal plural stage, although Zah was very accurate in producing plural nouns (32 times out of 36 plural contexts). As for K2, nine children produced phrasal plural agreement with definite quantifiers, and three of them comfortably used plural agreement with indefinite quantifiers as did Kin in K1. Only one child in this group (Aqa) did not progress to
phrasal agreement and was also rather inaccurate in marking lexical plurals (three times out of 25 plural contexts).

It may be worthwhile making a few specific points at this stage. First, regarding the relationship between the lexicon and the development of grammatical operations, it can be noted that the three children who did not attain the phrasal agreement stage also had not acquired lexical quantifiers. In other words, there was insufficient lexical material on which grammatical agreement could be predicated. It follows that the almost total absence of lexical verbs would make it impossible to get on to the higher stages of grammatical development. Second, results clearly confirm PT in terms of the sequencing of lexical morphology emerging before phrasal morphology in all cases, as can be appreciated from the implicational summary in Table 32. This is contrary to Charters et al.’s (2011) claim of a reverse order in a cross-sectional study of Vietnamese adolescents. Third, all children who acquired indefinite quantifiers also had numerical (definite) quantifiers as Table 32 shows. This confirms the phrasal procedure internal sequence of numeric (definite) quantifiers emerging before indefinite quantifiers such as many, lots of, and so on (Di Biase et al., 2015) in the acquisition of phrasal agreement.

The follow-up results, that is six months after the post-test, reveal that six out of the eight K1 children still maintained their productions of English lexical and phrasal plural marking as they had received one semester of the English L2 program in the second year of kindergarten. The plural development of the children in K1 and K2 at Time 3 experienced instability. According to PT stages, of the 15 children, three children were still at the single word stage, two children at the lexical plural stage and the other 10 children at the phrasal plural stage. However, the delayed post-test results
are based on cross-sectional data. The children had already acquired the lexical plural earlier followed by phrasal plural in their longitudinal developmental sequence.

The English program with DMFonF was effective. This indicates that six months of learning English in K1 and 1.5 years in K2 promoted lexical learning but not grammatical learning since the children did not show syntactic nor morphological development with rare and narrowly confined exceptions. This may indicate that solely communicative learning by itself may not be sufficient in promoting grammatical development. Results strongly suggest that some form of DMFonF is necessary to promote L2 development beyond purely lexical development.

Over the three months of DMFonF instruction, children in K1 and K2 groups were able to develop from the single word stage to the lexical stage and phrasal stage based on the PT hierarchy. As for the developmental sequence of plural marking, all children in K1 and K2 acquired lexical before phrasal plural. Within the Noun Phrase, plural agreement of a noun with a numeral quantifier was acquired before indefinite quantifiers. The developmental trajectory found in Indonesian children is compatible with previous PT studies involving different L1 learners.

The second question asks about the linguistic environment that the teacher provided in terms of DMFonF instruction and feedback. Table 38 summarises the teacher’s linguistic behaviour before and during the implementation of DMFonF instruction. Note that there were four recordings of sessions before DMFonF and six DMFonF sessions each with K1 and K2 groups with 12 recordings in total.
Table 38. Summary of the teacher’s linguistic behaviour in class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Teacher Linguistic Behaviour in Class</th>
<th>Before DMFonF</th>
<th>K1 Group</th>
<th>K2 Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Asks Question</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>No Correction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+FB</td>
<td>Positive Feedback (+form)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Request Repetition (individual or choral)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM+</td>
<td>Provides form</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW (+)</td>
<td>Repeat wrong form</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Clarification Request (what)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (+)</td>
<td>Teacher’s explicit correction (+form/EXPL) (NOT this but THAT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other input enhancement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Explanation Request (why)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before applying the DMFonF program, the teacher used six out of 12 categories in four lessons such as Q, +FB, RR, verbal CUE, FORM+, and EC (+)). The teacher tended to use feedback types in accordance with the focus on meaning. All these categories reinforce the children’s linguistic output. In contrast, the teacher did not use {R (recast) to attract children’s attention to errors, nor provide the correct form for the error. The teacher only used one of the two categories of negative feedback, i.e., EC (+)). The children also did not have any opportunities to receive correct forms when they made errors. This suggests the teacher could have provided more opportunities for the children to review and revise errors.

During the implementation of the DMFonF program, the teacher used the same nine categories in K1 and K2. The frequencies of feedback in all categories were much higher with the DMFonF program than the meaning-based classes, except CUE verbal with the K2 group.
Across the two classes, the teacher used different categories at different times. The teacher asked K1 more questions (individual/choral) than K2 and requested to repeat the correct forms more in K2 than K1. The teacher used more negative and positive feedback in K1 than in K2 and gave the highest positive feedback (+FB), i.e., 89 in K1 and 73 in K2 in the fourth meeting. In Session 4, the teacher taught lexical plurals consisting of adjective and noun in both K1 and K2. In K1, the teacher reviewed the previous lesson about lexical plural, whereas in K2 the teacher taught about lexical plural with adjective and noun. The higher use of \{R, CUE verbal and EC (+}\} in K1 was the most evident difference in the teacher’s feedback of the two groups. The teacher provided a lot of +FB in Session 4 because the children successfully produced lexical plurals. Overall, these results indicate that the higher usage of Q, +FB, and RR in both K1 and K2 aimed to emphasise learners’ output.

The teacher did not use three feedback categories during the DMFonF program such as no correction (NC), other input enhancement (O), and explanation request ((EX) in both K1 and K2. Perhaps there were no contexts for the teacher to use those feedback categories and maybe they were improper categories in the kindergarten level. Apart from the linguistic feedback categories, the teacher also provided general feedback to the children. For instance, the teacher sometimes corrected the children’s pronunciation and used nonverbal communication to ask questions of the children.

These findings arguably suggest that the more categories of feedback a teacher uses the more it is likely to contribute to promoting a better result. Further, the teacher’s use of interactional modification through conversational adjustments such as repetitions, comprehension checks, clarification requests, etc. promoted acquisition. This is because the negotiation of meaning “facilitates acquisition because it connects
input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways” (Long, 1996, pp. 451-452).

In summary, the teacher did certain things before the implementation of the DMFonF program and there was progress with what the teacher did in the English L2 classroom. The DMFonF program was an additional one for the usual meaning-based program. This program helped the teacher realise the importance of focus on form and it gave her more direction and structure on what to do in a valid strict order as well as the feedback that focuses on the forms being introduced. In the end, the teacher will continue to do whatever she does in the English L2 classroom.

5.7 Summary

This chapter presents and discusses the linguistic results of the lexical and grammatical development in English L2, focusing on plural marking -s on nouns using the DMFonF instruction by the Indonesian kindergarten children within Processability Theory. It also provides the results of the teacher’s linguistic input, interaction, and feedback in the L2 classroom. The findings suggest that the English L2 meaning-based program with the DMFonF instruction combined with communicative learning is effective. In terms of lexical development, over the three months of the DMFonF instruction, the K1 and K2 children learned many more lexical categories and types. For grammatical development, children in both groups were able to develop from the single word stage to the lexical stage and phrasal stage. The developmental sequence of lexical and phrasal plural marking in English L2 acquisition is consistent with the sequence predicted in PT.

To find out what the teacher did in the classroom during the implementation of the DMFonF program, this study examined the teacher’s linguistic behaviour in the
K1 and K2 classes. Before the implementation of the DMFonF program, the teacher used six out of 12 categories. During three months with the DMFonF instruction, the teacher used the same nine out of 12 categories in K1 and K2. The higher use of ‘asks question’ (Q), ‘positive feedback’ (+FB) and ‘request repetition’ (RR) in both groups may encourage the children’s output. The higher use of {R, CUE verbal and EC (+)} in K1 appears to offer the difference in the teacher’s feedback of the two groups. This suggests that more feedback categories from the teacher may promote second language development. The next chapter presents the findings from the teacher’s and parents’ perceptions of the children learning English L2, which may complement the linguistic results.
CHAPTER 6. TEACHER AND PARENT PERCEPTIONS, FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The previous chapter presents the linguistic analysis results and discussion of the DMFonF program in English L2 in an Indonesian kindergarten. This chapter presents and discusses teacher and parent perceptions of the children learning English L2. The first section, 6.1, draws on the three interviews of the teacher’s perception of teaching English L2 with DMFonF within the meaning-based English program. Section 6.2 presents the questionnaire data of the parents’ perceptions of the children learning English L2. Section 6.3 explores the semi-structured interviews with parents about their choice of school, the motivation for the children learning English L2 and the practice of English at home to add depth to the interpretation of the questionnaire results. The final section, Section 6.4, discusses and concludes teacher and parent perceptions towards learning English L2 at school and in the family.

6.1 Teacher perception of English L2 with DMFonF program

This section details the teacher’s perception of the DMFonF program. It draws on the teacher’s responses in four semi-structured interviews, one at the beginning, in the middle and after the DMFonF program (see Appendix 6 in more detail) and one as an informal conversation with the researcher outside the classroom. The interviews aimed at eliciting answers concerning the teacher’s strategies and practices used in the classroom to support children learning L2. The interviews were audio-recorded with
the teacher’s consent. Before the initial interview session, the teacher was a little anxious about the program and concerned she would not be able to follow the instructions as the material was new to her.

6.1.1 Interview 1: Before implementation of the DMFonF program

The first interview was held in the café near the kindergarten before the new semester began. The purpose of the first interview was to gain information on how the kindergarten children learnt English L2 before the intervention of the DMFonF program. The teacher was asked some questions about why parents put their children in kindergarten to learn English L2, the teacher’s practices in teaching English L2, including the lesson plan for the semester and her expectation of the English L2 program.

Parents’ choices of kindergarten

When the teacher, Sarah, was asked about the parents’ choices of kindergarten, she explained, “parents want their children to acquire basic English before entering elementary school so that they will not feel surprised”. Similar responses were found in the parents’ survey. Most parents wanted their children to be able to speak English from a young age and for their children to be well prepared for English classes for further education. The detailed results of the parents’ questionnaire are provided in Section 6.2 in this chapter.

Teacher’s practices in teaching English L2

When Sarah was asked about her teaching practices in the classroom, she stated “the focus in this school is not for English proficiency, but for motivating the children to speak English in daily activities”. The kindergarten had established the themes,
including vocabulary learning and expressions for the English program, which aligned with the general kindergarten educational program (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2014). Sarah shared her teaching practice experience as in the quote below.

English is a new language for these children, so I must prepare fun learning that makes them feel happy. When I give them instruction in English, they sometimes complain about that and they said, “Miss, can you just speak Indonesian”. Later, I will translate in Indonesian. I prefer to provide games with flashcards. I also asked the children to watch cartoons or stories in full English, sometimes the children did not like it and they said: “Miss, in Indonesian please”.

Sarah tried to create a language environment that aimed to motivate the children to use and learn English. Despite her efforts, the children sometimes complained when she delivered the full lesson using English. Thus, the practice of translating happened in the English L2 classroom. The use of L1 in English L2 classrooms is also found in Swain and Lapkin’s (2000) and Macaro’s (2000) studies. Based on their findings, teachers used the L1 with classes of students at a lower level to motivate and ease frustration. For learning another language, the use of L1 in the classroom may play a significant role in facilitating language learning, particularly with pre-school children (Scheffler & Domińska, 2018; Kerr, 2019).

In terms of the lesson plan, there were no detailed linguistic modules in the syllabus. Therefore, the English teachers were responsible for determining the details of the syllabus based on the themes provided by the school. Sarah wanted “to explore how to make the lesson easier for the children to remember the vocabularies and also expressions”. Examples of English expressions in the syllabus were “This is my father” and “It feels cold” (on the theme ‘My Body’).
In delivering the lesson, Sarah often encountered some challenges in teaching vocabulary and expression. At first, the children’s responses were slow when she taught some English expressions, particularly to the K1 group. It was difficult to explain some English expressions to K1 and K2 children because they were still learning their first language (Indonesian) and at the same time, learning English as a second language. To overcome this matter, Sarah had an idea for K1 children “to give them some games using flashcards for teaching the vocabulary.” Sarah expected the K1 and K2 children to be brave and speak English.

6.1.2 Interview 2: In the middle of the DMFonF program

The second interview was conducted a month after the DMFonF program in the kindergarten. The purpose of the second interview, which had four questions (see Appendix 6 in more detail), was to identify the teacher’s experiences using the DMFonF instruction and feedback in the English L2 classroom.

Teacher’s reflections on the DMFonF program

In the second interview, the teacher explained that after applying the DMFonF program, the children understood plurality in English; they had followed the lesson and understood what she taught. Sarah also felt less anxious and more comfortable using the DMFonF program. Before implementing the DMFonF program, Sarah had taught vocabulary items without grammar to the children. Sarah was worried the children would need longer to understand the grammatical concepts. Surprisingly, after one month using the DMFonF instruction and feedback, the children were able to differentiate singular and plural nouns. Sarah exclaimed, “it is beyond my expectation”.
For example, at the beginning of the DMFonF program, Sarah used flashcards in delivering the program to K1 and K2 groups. After the children could memorise some forms, Sarah asked them to play games using flashcards. Sarah explained:

They had to find the missing pieces of the flashcard that I showed them before. But not all students could do that, some students did not want to answer my questions especially when I was in K1. They were not able to focus or concentrate. Finally, I asked one by one when I found some students did not want to speak when they were together with their friends. Some students did not have a good mood. So, I did not want to force them.

Since all children were not interested in answering the teacher’s questions related to the grammatical forms, she changed her strategy. For example, she asked the children some questions individually while not forcing the children who were disinterested to participate in the program.

Engaging the children in the program became an important part of the implementation. How the teacher engaged children depended on the context and situation in the L2 classroom. The children followed the teacher’s lead. When Sarah used English, the children tried to answer in English; when Sarah used Indonesian, the children used Indonesian. Sarah explained:

The instructions that I gave them were new for them. If the word was something new and I never told them before, they said to me: “What did you say, Miss? I did not understand it. Just say it in Bahasa Indonesia”. Then, I used Bahasa Indonesia with them.

The children were often confused when the teacher asked them to do something in English. For example, when Sarah said, “Please say stop”, the children did not understand what to do. This happened every time the teacher gave new vocabulary items to the children. Therefore, the teacher worked to build the language environment
to encourage the children to speak English. During the implementation of the DMFonF program, the teacher experienced both the usefulness and the difficulties of the program that will be discussed in the next subsection.

**The benefits and constraints in applying the DMFonF program**

When asked about the usefulness of the DMFonF program in the classroom, Sarah shared her feelings:

> Yes, it is greatly beneficial. It means that we do not have any method like this before. When I tried it, and it was not that hard for me or students. So, this method is especially useful. I hope for the future we can use this method in teaching English.

Sarah also identified obstacles in delivering the program to the K2 group. Children in K2 were often exhausted and complained about the program to the teacher. For example, the children often said, “Huff, I am tired!” and “Huff, that again!”.

The DMFonF program was delivered for 20-25 minutes only two times a week. Despite these short sessions, the K2 children still felt bored. Sarah explained:

> The children said to me “Miss, why do we study this all the time?” I experienced that once. That was one of my challenges and finally, I had to think about how to teach students that made them feel happy in this learning. It happened in K2 class. They learned English in the afternoon and they were in the regular classroom in the morning. K2 students always complained to me. In contrast, K1 students did not feel bored. Because they received English lesson in the morning. For K2 students, I had to use another method so they would not be bored. That was how I feel. (Sarah 6)

Thus, Sarah tried to make the children’s learning experiences happy and fun. For example, Sarah often used games in her teaching such as finding the cards. Sometimes Sarah asked the children to learn outside class and play movement games.
What Sarah did was to engage and interact with the children, which is typical of the CLT approach so that they felt excited about undergoing this program. When Sarah wanted to focus on learning the language forms, she asked the children to sit down in the classroom and she recorded the session. The teacher’s reflections after implementing the DMFonF program for three months are presented in the next section.

6.1.3 Interview 3: After the DMFonF program

The last interview was conducted three weeks after the post-test in the kindergarten. The interview was about the evaluation, challenges, and the conclusion of the implementation of the DMFonF program. In the interview, the teacher reflected on her teaching strategies and classroom practice using the DMFonF program.

At the beginning of the program, Sarah “felt that the method was quite difficult to introduce to the children”. As Sarah became more familiar with the program, she introduced more creative teaching methods for the children. She felt quite optimistic about continuing to teach vocabulary using the DMFonF program.

Sarah sometimes changed her teaching strategy from day to day. She tried new teaching strategies with the K1 group first, then the K2 group.

For example, I made a plan that I would use. Then, I evaluated it because I felt it was not effective. Finally, I changed the plan for K2 students. It always happened when I had a new method. I would try it first for K1 students when I felt it was less effective, I did not use it for K2 students. Then, I tried to find another method.

Sarah often used YouTube for learning English through songs, movies, and cartoons. When the children watched some videos, the teacher sometimes asked them about the activities in the movie. The children were excited when the teacher used the
technology. However, she did not use the technology when she taught grammatical forms in the DM FonF program.

**Teacher’s evaluation of the DM FonF program**

Sarah stated that the DM FonF program was particularly good. Sarah also said, “I taught something new to the children, but I did not give the theory to them”. Sarah taught grammatical theories such as English singular and plural without explaining the theory. For example, Sarah introduced a card depicting a single apple and many apples to the children, then, she asked the children to repeat what she said. Sarah assumed that “they will remember the lesson for a long time”.

Sarah stated that the children could apply the singular plural forms in English to other objects, which were not in the lesson plan. The children could differentiate between singular and plural in the picture cards. However, they sometimes became confused when they did not know how to answer in English.

When asked about her plan to apply the DM FonF method in the future, Sarah explains:

> From the beginning, I felt confused because I was not sure if they could distinguish singular and plural or not. They could do it. I was thinking that I wanted to do it again by using other pictures and more vocabulary. This bilingual class program has many targets. I could insert it into the learning theme, and it needs three months. But I think I could insert it into the learning themes. So, I could insert singular and plural forms in vocabulary learning. Maybe I will apply it in one year in every learning, which is not specifically learning about singular and plural. I was hoping with the longer time, the students could finish the program in one year. Although it did not review again, they could understand what they had learned.
Sarah expressed her concerns in teaching English plural that she needed more time to teach the plural forms to K1 and K2 groups as she mentioned her concerns about this:

I tried to teach “some, any, a lot of” to K2 students yesterday, they could understand it, especially when they used “a lot of”. Due to the limited time that we had, I could not teach them intensively. After almost one month without the DMFonF program, I did not provide the opportunity to review the lesson. I thought they could remember it. I am also curious when K1 students will go to the next level in their second year of kindergarten. Will they still remember it or not? I hope they could remember what they had learned even though I did not review the plural forms in class. The point is in the process and the time. If we have enough time, they can differentiate the use of quantifiers.

Overall, Sarah’s experience with the DMFonF program was especially useful. However, three months was not long enough for her to achieve the learning goal that she had planned. Therefore, Sarah was concerned about the length of time in the instruction. The challenges that Sarah went through during the program are presented in the next subsection.

**The challenges in teaching and learning with the DMFonF program**

The teacher identified two challenges in teaching English with the DMFonF program. The first was teaching English singular and plural. Sarah had to know how to teach singular and plurals in English to the children who previously had never received that lesson.

The second was teaching English noun phrases. English plurals may include phrasal constructions. Sarah had to differentiate the concept of noun phrases in English and Indonesian. For example, ‘dua buah apel merah’ in Indonesian consists of a number with a classifier (dua buah) followed by a noun (apel) and an adjective (merah). Then, Sarah translated in English ‘two red apples’ consisting of a number
followed by an adjective and a noun. Sometimes, the children could not produce the English noun phrase correctly. Sarah elaborates:

The most challenging was teaching English noun phrases. Because I had to know how to explain to them. For example, “apel merah” is Bahasa Indonesia in English becomes “a red apple”. I said, “the colour first then the object”. It was different when I taught “numbers” with “colours”. For instance, I said “dua buah apel merah” in Bahasa Indonesia then I translated in English “two red apples”. The students still could not say correctly. They said, “two apple red”. That was the most challenging thing for me.

Sarah shares a parent’s comment regarding the child’s plural production at home in the quote below.

There was a K1 student who used plural in Indonesian. When he was at home, he saw there were two motorcycles, and he said, “two motors”. He could put -s at the end of the noun. Another K1 student also added -s in Indonesian words such as “pulpens and bukus”. Pulpens means pens in English and bukus means books.

In summary, this study suggests that three months with the DMFonF instruction brings positive impacts for the teacher and the children. The teacher gained knowledge in teaching English grammatical structures implicitly and the children received input about those structures from the teacher unconsciously in a fun learning classroom setting. The teacher had to take account of context by engaging the children in the program, change strategies to encourage the children to speak and adjust for the time devoted to the program, particularly when she taught English lexical and phrasal plural. The results of parents’ perceptions about the English L2 program for their children are presented in the next section.
6.2 Parents’ perceptions about the children learning English L2 based on questionnaire data

This section describes the questionnaire results regarding the parents’ perceptions of the children learning English L2. The purpose of identifying parental perceptions is to obtain evidence relating their support for the children to learn English L2 at an early age and understand their desire for their children and any practices at home that contribute to learning English. The questionnaire results were completed by 20 parents of children participating in this study. The parents’ questionnaire (see Appendix 5) consisted of the demographic profile of parents, language background, reasons for sending the child to a school that has an English program, parents’ expectations from the English L2 program, English language exposure at home and other informal supports for the children learning English L2.

6.2.1 Demographical profile of parents

The demographic profile of parents is composed of considerably more mothers (85%) than fathers (15%). Parents’ ages range from 30 to 47 years old, with an average age of 38. Parents’ occupations included home duties, entrepreneur, teacher, civil servant, private employee, bank employee, bartender, dermatologist, and primary school principal. All parents were from a middle-class background. Most parents had a bachelor’s degree. A few parents had a higher degree education and a high school degree (see Chapter 4 in more detail).

6.2.2 Language background

The details on the language backgrounds of children’s parents are presented in Figures 9 and 10. The following figure shows parents’ first language of participating children
in the program. A majority, 12 out of 20 (60%) parents spoke the national language, i.e., Indonesian as their first language. The other eight parents spoke vernacular languages consisting of seven Sundanese (35%) and one Javanese (5%) as their first language.
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**Figure 9. Parents’ first language (L1)**

Figure 10 presents the second language of the children’s parents. Eight out of 20 (40%) parents spoke Indonesian as their second language. Seven out of 20 parents spoke vernacular languages consisting of six Sundanese (30%), two Javanese (10%) and one Palembangnese (5%). The remaining two parents spoke English L2 (10%) and one parent did not answer (5%).
The following Table 39 presents the parents’ languages mainly spoken at home. All parents spoke Indonesian with their children at home. Fifteen parents spoke mainly Indonesian at home with their spouses. Thirteen parents spoke Indonesian with their relatives. Three parents spoke Sundanese at home with their spouses and five with relatives. Seven parents used both Indonesian and Sundanese when they spoke with their spouses (three parents) and relatives (four parents). One parent spoke Palembangnese, one of the vernacular languages in South Sumatera, with a spouse.

Interestingly, there was one parent who spoke English with her spouse from the US. Four parents chose ‘no answer’ in response to the language used with relatives.
Table 39. Parents’ languages mainly used at home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language spoken</th>
<th>with spouse</th>
<th>with children</th>
<th>with relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>15 (75%)</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
<td>13 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Indonesian and Sundanese</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palembanginese</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, Indonesian is the language used by most parents either as a first or second language and Indonesian is most used at home with children, spouses, and relatives. Only a few parents spoke vernacular languages as a first or second language. Two parents spoke English as their second language. However, this does not mean that they speak English in daily life. This may be because they only speak Indonesian and cannot speak vernacular languages. Therefore, they chose English, a foreign language they learned at school, as their second language.

6.2.3 Parents’ reasons for choosing a school that has an English program

The parents’ reasons for sending their children to a kindergarten with an English program varied. In the questionnaire, parents were asked to respond to each of six statements using “strongly agree”, “agree”, “disagree” and “strongly disagree”. Most parents chose “agree” for each reason as shown in Table 39 below.
Table 40. Reasons for sending the child to a school that has an English program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I want my child to speak English from a young age.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15 (75%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I want my child to have international opportunities.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16 (80%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I want my child to be able to study abroad in the future.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I want my child to be well informed and alert to cultural differences.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My other children can speak basic English.</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16 (80%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I want my child to prepare for English classes later.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for Table 40 show a majority, sixteen (80%) parents want their children to have international opportunities with four (20%) parents strongly agreeing with the statement. Fifteen out of 20 (75%) parents want their children to be able to speak English from a young age with five (25%) parents strongly agreeing with the statement. Twelve (60%) parents want their children to study abroad in the future with eight (40%) parents strongly agreeing.

Most parents, 14 out of 20 (70%), want their children to be well informed and alert to cultural differences with six parents (30%) strongly agreeing with the statement. While 16 parents indicate their other children could speak basic English, two parents strongly disagree and two do not respond to the statement. Fourteen parents, i.e., more than half of the respondents (70%), also want their children to be
prepared for English classes in further education and six parents (30%) strongly agree with the statement.

In summary, all parents have ambitions to equip their children with cosmopolitan capital (Weenink, 2008). This is because they want their children to prepare for a globalising world. This can be seen from their reasons for choosing a school with an English program for their children. In terms of literacy sponsors, agents who can support the learners in terms of literacy (Brandt, 1998), most parents indicate their other children can speak basic English. If other children in the family speak English, which is common, then there are further opportunities for English language learning at an informal level. This means that parents aspire for the children to learn English as early as possible in to prepare for the children’s future life.

6.2.4 Parents’ expectations for their children’s competencies in English

Parents’ expectations from the English L2 kindergarten program varied. Parents could indicate their level of expectation using five options ranging from “not at all”, “very little”, “to some extent”, “to a great extent”, or not answering. More than half the parents chose “to some extent” in responding to the six stated expectations from the program, as shown in Table 41 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Parents’ expectations</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To great extent</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Child will learn English vocabularies.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Child will develop good English pronunciation.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Child will gain good basic conversation such as greetings.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Child will acquire good reading skills in English.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Child will be able to write in English.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Child will understand spoken English such as English TV programs, videos, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked to what extent they expected their children would learn English vocabularies from the English L2 program, eleven (55%) parents chose “to some extent”; eight (40%) chose “to a great extent”; and only one (5%) chose “very little”. Twelve (60%) parents expected their children would develop good English “to some extent” and eight (40%) parents chose “to great extent” from the program.

Eleven (55%) parents expected their children would gain good basic conversation “to some extent” from the program, eight (40%) parents chose to a great extent and one (5%) parent chose “very little”. Twelve (60%) parents expected their children would acquire good reading skills in English to some extent from the program, seven (35%) parents “to a great extent” and one parent (5%) did not respond.

Fourteen (70%) parents expected, from the program to some extent, that their children would be able to write in English, while five (25%) parents responded to a
great extent and only one (5%) parent responded, “very little”. Eleven (55%) parents expected their children would understand spoken English from the English L2 program to some extent, eight (40%) parents nominated to a great extent, and one (5%) parent responded, “very little”.

Nine parents specified their expectations and commented on the open-ended questions regarding the English L2 program. Most parents, five out of nine parents, wanted their children to gain English ability such as speaking and writing; and one of them suggested inviting a native speaker of English. The other three parents assumed that the program was more than enough; they just wanted to introduce English to their children from an early age so that they got used to it. Only one parent aspired for her child to gain the social ability and have good character.

In summary, all parents had expectations about competencies from the kindergarten English L2 program in different ways. Most parents believe their children would learn more about the basic language skills in English L2 such as speaking, listening, reading, and writing in this program to some extent while some other parents chose to a great extent and only a few parents responded very little and one with no answer. The last theme in the questionnaire about informal English language learning is presented in the next subsection.

6.2.5 English language exposure at home and other support for children learning English L2

Informal opportunities for the children to learn English are related to sponsors of literacy (Brandt, 1998). Based on the questionnaire result, a majority, 16 out of 20 (80%) children, did not use English at home to communicate with their families. Four
children (20%) sometimes spoke English at home, two with parents, one with a sibling and grandfather, and one with a sibling only.

In terms of provision of tools and materials, the availability of learning programs or devices for the children learning English L2 at home varied, as shown in Table 42. Parents could choose one option from never, occasionally, a few times per week, almost every day and no answer in response to eight questions. Most parents nominated occasionally in response to eight questions. Some parents indicated their child watched the English programs and used some devices in seven questions a few times per week, only a few parents responded almost every day.

Table 42. Programs or devices that the children use to learn English L2 at home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Programs or devices</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>A few times per week</th>
<th>Almost everyday</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English TV program made in Indonesia.</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>15 (75%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English TV program made in English speaking countries.</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English videos such as Finding Nemo, My Little Pony, The Good Dinosaur, Postman Pat, etc</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>English audios such as audio book or children’s song audio CD.</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Electronic devices such as smartphone and tablet equipped with English learning apps for kids (e.g., Lingokids, English for kids)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>English books such as story book, activities book, etc.</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Website for sharing video such as YouTube, Me Tube, etc.</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English games such as online learning games, English learning apps, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the questionnaire results reveal parents’ perceptions relating to the English L2 program as positive. Most parents of children enrolled in the kindergarten with English L2 program demonstrated very enthusiastic attitudes toward the program. Parents facilitated their children with some devices to support them in learning English at home. They believe that an early start in English L2 learning can help develop their children’s English knowledge, which would be useful for their future life.

### 6.3 Semi-structured interview with parents

This section presents the results of the interview analysis with parents about their choice of kindergarten for their child, the motivation for the children learning English L2 and the practice of English at home. The interview information supplements parents’ answers in the questionnaire. The individual interviews were conducted with nine parents: four parents from the K1 group and five from the K2 group. Each interview session was held after the end of the DMFonF program.

#### 6.3.1 The choice of kindergarten and parents’ motivation for the children learning English L2

When the parents were asked about their choice of kindergarten and motivation for their child to learn English L2, their responses fell into two broad themes. These are understood in terms of building children’s capital and cosmopolitanism.
Forms of capital

Parents aspired to three forms of capital for their children, as emerged from the interview data: cultural, social, and linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1986). Cultural capital refers to experience and knowledge; social capital relates to social obligations or network connections; and linguistic capital as a form of cultural capital relates to the individual’s language value (Bourdieu, 1986).

In terms of choice of school and motivation, all parents aspired for the children to acquire cultural and linguistic capital. Only one parent wanted his child to acquire three forms of capital regarding the choice of school. In terms of motivation, most parents had ambitions for their children to acquire cultural, social, and linguistic capital while three parents only wanted their children to acquire cultural and linguistic capital. Table 43 summarises parents’ responses in the interview relating to the forms of capital.

Table 43. Parents’ responses in the interview regarding the forms of capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Choice of school</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aep</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lis</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vik</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ast</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interview analysis with parents presented below demonstrates three forms of capital that they want to aspire for their children. The interview analysis is divided into three categories based on parents’ occupations: professional, entrepreneur and hospitality.

**Professional parents**

Seven parents have professional jobs such as civil servant, teacher, dermatologist, and private sector employee. The analyses of parents’ interviews are presented in the following.

Did, father of Zah from K1, has a professional job as a civil servant. When Did was asked about the choice of kindergarten, he answered that “nowadays English is very important”. He wants Zah to acquire cultural and linguistic capital. He also demonstrates social capital from his own social network in choosing the school for his child. For example, Did gained information about the prospective school from the teacher of a literacy course in an after-school centre his other daughter attended. The teacher there suggested the kindergarten in this study to him. Did explains:

Zah’s sister’s school recommended this kindergarten and also from Zah’s sister literacy course. There is a good kindergarten in our neighbourhood, but we decided to choose this school.

Another parent, Fin, mother of Kia from K1, is also a civil servant like Did. Fin is setting her daughter up with cultural and social capital, as she believes that having English knowledge will help her child have more opportunities to obtain higher qualified employment in the future.

It is evident that Fin has acquired the cultural capital that goes with her job, including speaking very well and having a university degree. Fin demonstrates her
cultural capital in the knowledge about the best time for her child to learn English as in the following comment:

I want to introduce a foreign language to my child because this is the best time for the child when she easily understands the basic things so that in the future she will know about English.

This means that Fin wants her child to acquire cultural and linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1986) and perhaps prepare her child to learn English for an academic qualification in the future.

When Fin was asked about the motivation for her child to learn English L2, she said:

I want my child’s academic achievement to develop in classroom learning as well as social life with her friends to be independent, have a good moral value which is learned continuously, and possessing individual skill such as in art or other things.

It is evident in this insightful comment by Fin that there is an awareness of the kinds of cultural and social capital that can be gained through learning English. Fin can see that her child will gain both knowledge and social networks. That is, in addition to acquiring knowledge, she wants her child to socialise with a wide network of people so that she would be an independent child with an outward-looking attitude. This social capital for her child would enable her to engage in social arenas that require knowledge, competencies, and attitudes (Weeninks, 2008).

Eli, mother of Pan from K1, is a regular class teacher in the kindergarten where this study was conducted. When asked about the choice of school, she said, “because there is a bilingual program, and this is the Islamic school”. Eli wants her son to acquire
cultural capital by sending her son to this kindergarten and explains the motivation for her child to learn English:

Well, I want my child to be more global, particularly English is needed in the future, so my motivation is that hopefully, their English knowledge will be more advanced. They learn vocabulary items first in kindergarten then continue to learn how to give the command so that they understand and keep adapting to the circumstances.

Eli wants her son to have an international orientation through learning English, which is clearly articulated as linguistic, cultural, and social capital.

Net, mother of Niz from K1, is another teacher in this kindergarten and a teacher of English. Net explains the reasons she chose this school in the quote below.

I choose this school because firstly, it is an Islamic school; secondly, the bilingual class. I am trying to introduce my child to a language other than Indonesian. Besides Indonesian as a daily language, there is an English program in this school even though it is still simple.

Net demonstrates her cultural capital in choosing this school because of the Islamic value. Moreover, she wants to introduce a language other than Indonesian to her child which is English.

When asked about the motivation for her child to learn English, Net says:

It depends. For myself, I just want to introduce English to my child. I do not want to oblige him to learn English because he is still young.

As Net is an English teacher in the bilingual class of this kindergarten, her realisation of the importance of English for their child in the future may be heightened. This means that she may think English has value so that she prepares her child for the
linguistic market. Stanley (2013) states that the biggest language market is for English and it is in China.

Win, mother of Zai from K2, is a dermatologist. About the choice of kindergarten, Win states:

Because there is a bilingual program in English. I think nowadays we need English so that she will not be left behind like her mother and her former school was Cambridge pre-school in Bandung.

According to Win’s answer, she chose this kindergarten because of the bilingual program just like her daughter’s previous school, which has an internationalised stream. Win demonstrates her cultural and linguistic capital before the child commenced this school. Win continued to send her child to the school, which has an English program to maintain her child’s knowledge of English. She does not want her daughter to be left behind like her in terms of English knowledge.

When Win is asked about the motivation for her child to learn English from early childhood, she says:

I just think that nowadays English is especially important for example, if you want to continue your study in higher education you must take a TOEFL test. I learned English in Junior High School and now I never learned English and I did not speak English at all at home at that time. When I was at school there was no conversation class.

Win demonstrates her cultural and linguistic capital from her professional life as a specialist doctor. Win experiences that English is necessary for further study. She mentions that taking an English competency test is the main requirement for continuing a higher level of education. Win learned English from Year 7 until
Win adds the statement about the motivation for her child as in the quote below.

When I was at the university, I realised I really needed English and when I met a foreign patient using English, I was so nervous, I did not want to meet him. I do not want my daughter like that. English is a universal language. When we went to Singapore and Malaysia for holiday, she was excited and proud then she said, “Mom, I heard English here”.

Win realises the importance of learning English from the time she was at the university. She experienced that she rejected her foreign patient just because she was not confident to speak English to her patient. She uses her experience to facilitate her child to learn English as a global language at an early age. This means that she wants her child to acquire social and linguistic capital for the child’s future life.

Vik, mother of Aqi from K2, is a private sector employee. She chose this kindergarten because of some reasons as seen in the following quote.

First, because this school is very close to our home. Second is I like the program in this school such as the Islamic study. The third is the bilingual program. Then this is a full-day school … because I am working so I cannot accompany my son until the afternoon so I am looking for a school that can accommodate all of them starting from the Islamic study then he can learn English in the bilingual program then he can learn many positive activities until the afternoon when I go back home.

As a working mother, Vik is quite practical. She chose the kindergarten that could fulfill her needs. Vik realises that she cannot look after her child when she works so she sent her child to this kindergarten, which has a complete package. Vik
demonstrates her cultural capital to her child regarding her choice of school particularly the Islamic value and the English program.

Vik shares her motivation for her child to learn English L2.

I want my son to grow up to be smart, his morality is also good, then his English knowledge is also good.

Vik has an ambition for her child to acquire cultural and linguistic capital through learning English. In terms of cultural capital, Vik aspires for her son to become an intelligent person and have good behaviour. Vik also wants her son to gain competence in English for his future life.

Ast, mother of Fah from K2, is also a private sector employee just like Vik. Ast chose this school because “it is very close to our house and there is a bilingual program, which introduces English from the early ages”. Ast’s answer is like Vik’s in terms of choosing a school close to home and the English program.

When asked about the motivation for her child to learn English, Ast says:

So that he knows English from the pre-school age, at least he recognises the letters, numbers that his mother has taught to him.

It is evident that Ast realises the kinds of cultural and linguistic capital that can be obtained through learning English at an early age.

Entrepreneur parent

Lis, mother of Vit in the K2 group, is an entrepreneur. When Lis was asked about the choice of kindergarten, she said “well, the children will have a broader knowledge and also their English knowledge will be more advanced”. As an entrepreneur mother, who often travels to other countries for business, Lis realises the importance of English for her child. Lis demonstrates cultural and linguistic capital for her child to acquire global
capital and cosmopolitanism (Weenink, 2008). Lis wants her child to be an open-minded person and she hopes her child’s English would be better.

Lis explains her motivation for the children to learn English in the quote below.

Well, maybe we have been traveling to other countries so that I want my children in the future can socialise and think more broadly. I wish they can study abroad. That is what I want.

Lis often travels abroad and aspires for her children to engage in a global social arena (Weenink, 2008) as well as to explore the world in the future. This means that Lis also wants her children to acquire social capital.

**A parent who works in the hospitality sector**

Aep, father of Que from K2, is a bartender. In terms of choice of school Aep says, “my English is not good, so I want my child to be smarter than me”. Aep aspires for his child to acquire linguistic capital because he knows that English has value. Aep explains his motivation for his child to learn English.

So that she can understand, and it would be not too monotonous with her language. She will know the words that are often used if she meets people. If she can speak English, she will be able to speak with someone using English.

Aep is aware of the kind of social capital that can be acquired through learning English. Aep wants his child to learn English for socialising. Aep is preparing for his child to have a network in the future.

In summary, all parents aspire for their children to have linguistic capital as a form of cultural capital. Some forms of capital will bring benefit for their child because of learning English from an early age. Having gained some linguistic capital, the children would then potentially also have more opportunities to heighten their social
and cultural capital because they speak English L2. The approach to English language acquisition also reveals a particular kind of cosmopolitan disposition, as discussed in the next section.

**Cosmopolitanism**

To understand how parents talk about global capital, this subsection draws on Weenink (2008) who argues that there are two types of cosmopolitan parents: dedicated and pragmatic. Three out of nine parents showed themselves to be dedicated cosmopolitans while the other six parents are categorised as pragmatic cosmopolitans based on the interview data.

Dedicated cosmopolitan parents have a belief that the world is open and needs to be explored by their children and they try to open their children’s minds to foreign cultures (Weenink, 2008). Pragmatic cosmopolitan parents realise the benefit of international orientation, however, they do not relate to looking at the world beyond borders (Weenink, 2008). They focus on the international orientation for the future career of their children, but they value local cultural traditions highly. In this case, Islam is an important component of their lives.

**a. Dedicated Cosmopolitan**

Three parents showed themselves to be dedicated cosmopolitan parents. They want to teach their children that the world should be explored (Weenink, 2008). One parent, Net, displays a feeling of global connectedness (Weenink, 2008) when discussing parents’ motivation for their child to learn English. Net said, “I want my children will be successful like studying abroad”. This means that Net as a mother is categorised as an internationally oriented parent (Weenink, 2008). Net is also a type of dedicated cosmopolitan parent (Weenink, 2008) who can look beyond borders and has an
ambition for the children that the world out there should be explored. It might be that because she is an English teacher, she already has an international outlook.

Two parents, Win and Lis, have travelled overseas. They display their willingness to look beyond borders (Weenink, 2008). Win, wants her child to learn English in a school, which has an English program because she does not want her daughter to be left behind like she was in terms of English knowledge. Win realises the importance of English as a global language. Cosmopolitanisation (Weenink, 2008) is a reality for Win. When Win went to Singapore and Malaysia for holiday, her daughter was very enthusiastic and proud that she could hear people speak English. Win is a type of dedicated cosmopolitan parent who is open “to look beyond borders” (Weenink, 2008, p. 1094).

When Win is asked about the motivation for her child to learn English from early childhood, she says:

I just want my daughter to understand English and the most important thing is she can communicate with foreigners and she understands the language. I want my daughter can speak more than one language.

Win is a dedicated cosmopolitan because she tries to teach her daughter to become a flexible person and adjust to foreign cultures. Win wants her daughter to have an international outlook and be open-minded to foreign cultures.

Another parent, Lis wants her children “in the future to socialise and think more broadly”. Lis also aspires for her children to study abroad. Lis is a dedicated cosmopolitan parent (Weenink, 2008), i.e., she wants her children to have an international outlook and to engage with others. It might be because Lis is an entrepreneur who likes traveling to other countries.
Lis travels overseas for business and is quite strong in her ambition for the children to study abroad. She wants her children in the future to ‘socialise and think more broadly’. She tries to develop a cosmopolitan identity in the transnational paradigm (Sole, 2013) by sending her child to a school that has an English program.

b. Pragmatic Cosmopolitan

The responses of six parents indicate that a pragmatic cosmopolitan approach (Weenink, 2008) motivates their decision for their child to learn English from an early age. Pragmatic cosmopolitans value the advantages of learning English for the future of their children (Weenink, 2008). Three areas that the parents identified as important in their decision resonate with these characteristics of pragmatic cosmopolitanism: the English program, Islamic values and being close to home.

**English program**

In the interview data, Aep says, “my English is not good, so I want my child to be smarter than me”. Aep is a pragmatic cosmopolitan parent because he sees English has a high value as a preparation for the child’s future life but so do dedicated cosmopolitans. Pragmatic and dedicated cosmopolitan parents are ambitious for their children (Weenink, 2008). Dedicated cosmopolitans want to teach their children to explore the world while pragmatic cosmopolitans emphasise the benefit of learning English for the future of their children’s lives and they have no interest in cultural diversity (Weenink, 2008).

Ast chose this school because it has a bilingual program that can introduce English at an early age. Ast was aware of the importance of learning English at a young age. This means that Ast is a pragmatic cosmopolitan parent who emphasises the practical use of learning English L2 for the future of her child.
When Did is asked about the motivation for the children learning English, he answers that he is very interested in the school, which has an English program. He also says, “English will be a mandatory subject at school so that she can survive in the future”. He also adds that “it might be in the future she would have some friends from other countries who can speak English.” According to his answer, he applies a pragmatic cosmopolitan (Weenink, 2008) because he has a plan for the future of his daughter, and he wants his daughter to socialise with foreigners who can speak English.

Islamic value
Vik and Eli chose this school because of the English program and the Islamic value. They want their children to learn English and they want to keep the Islamic faith. For example, Vik wants the morality of her child to be good so that the child will not lose his identity. Due to the focus on Islamic values, they are not exactly dedicated cosmopolitan parents but pragmatic. These pragmatic cosmopolitan parents have plans for their children in the future but not at the expense of their local culture. In terms of being pragmatic cosmopolitan, a focus on the English and Islamic values separates these parents from dedicated cosmopolitans.

Close to home
Ast and Vik chose this school because it is very close to their homes and the English program. These two mothers are private-sector employees. As working mothers, they cannot fully accompany their children during the daytime. Therefore, they chose a school, which could accommodate their needs. They are very practical because they want their children to learn English, but the school must be close to their homes.
It can be concluded that there are two types of cosmopolitan parents that emerged in the interview data about the choice of kindergarten and the motivation for the children to learn English. Most parents reflect a cosmopolitan openness in the sense that they want to prepare their children for the era of globalisation.

Six parents are classified as pragmatic cosmopolitan parents, and three parents are typical of dedicated cosmopolitan parents. Both pragmatic and dedicated cosmopolitan parents have ambitions for their children. Pragmatic cosmopolitan parents notice the advantages of learning English, but they do not aspire for the children to explore the world. For parents who are categorised as dedicated cosmopolitans, they possibly want to challenge their child to mingle with other cultures and to explore the world. This means that most of the parents have practical reasons in choosing this school and are motivated for their children to learn English in preparation for an increasing globalist world.

6.3.2 The role of literacy sponsor

In some families, there are several literacy sponsors. Literacy sponsors are people who have the power to support literacy learning (Brandt, 1998). If no person can speak English at home, another way in which a parent will sponsor the learning of English is through the provision of tools and materials.

When parents were asked about the practice of English at home, most parents responded that they sometimes spoke English with their child, and they provide the learning materials and devices to learn English at home. The literacy sponsors emerged from the interview, i.e., family, relatives, and friends. The provision of tools and materials is important to assist the children to learn English L2. The detailed analysis
of family, relatives, and friends as sponsors of literacy is presented first, followed by
the provision of tools and materials.

**Family and friends as sponsors of literacy**

When discussing the practice of English at home, most children’s parents in K1 and
K2 sometimes speak limited English with their child at home. Nine children live in
nuclear families. Eleven children live in extended families. They are likely to use
Indonesian with their parents and grandparents. There are also some family members
such as siblings and a grandfather who can speak basic English at home.

Did sometimes speaks English to Zah in the evenings such as *“let’s go to eat.”*
Another parent, Fin, sometimes speaks English words to name an object with Kia. This
means that Did and Fin are the literacy sponsors for their child.

For the practice of English at home, Net sometimes speaks English at home
with simple English commands with Niz. Sometimes she plays with her child such as
singing English songs or watching English videos and counting in English. Niz
sometimes speaks English with his younger brother when they watch a video such as
*“that’s a car. that’s a car and one two.”* Niz also speaks some English words with his
friends and his relative. Net is a literacy sponsor for her son. She encourages her son
to speak English with simple English expressions. Moreover, she also accompanies
her son to watch English videos. This means that family and peers are sponsors of
literacy for Net’s son.

Another parent, Eli, sometimes speaks English words and noun phrases that are
mixed with Indonesian words with her child Pan from the K1 group. For example, Eli
said, *‘ambilkan book’* and *open.* The word *ambilkan* in the phrase *ambilkan book*
means ‘get’ in English. Eli tried to build an English environment at home with her
child. She encourages her son to speak English even though she codemixes English
with Indonesian. According to Solé (2013, p. 336), “language learning needs to be done in tandem with the personal experiences and cultural history of the learner and acknowledge their cultural baggage irrespective of national boundaries”. This means that learning language in any situation needs to accommodate the individual experience and cultural background. In this case, Eli and her son are Indonesian; they live in the Sundanese culture. Therefore, Eli tries to build the English environment at home by accommodating the child’s needs. Eli might encourage her son to speak English by entering the child’s world. However, she does not fully use English with her son. She codemixes her command with English and Indonesian. Eli is using what is called ‘translanguaging’ (Canagarajah, 2011). She is shuttling between the known and unknown drawing on cultural history, which is simply understandings.

Eli notices that since the English program began, when her son speaks Indonesian, sometimes it is influenced by English. For example, *buku* ‘book’ and *mobil* ‘car’. Her son adds *-s* at the end of Indonesian words. In this case, Eli’s son is a hybrid speaker (Piller, 2002). This means that he unconsciously becomes a bilingual child. He starts to think of his language influenced by other languages. The identity is not going to be fully Indonesian or like his parents because of this transnational knowledge and the mobility of language and ideas.

For the practice of English at home, Aep never speaks English with Que. However, the child often tells her parents what she learned from the English program. Sometimes Que speaks English words with her mother such as *please* and *look*. This might be because Aep’s daughter felt excited about the English program so that she told her father about what she learned at the kindergarten. According to Sole (2013), this child has a different identity because, in the age of globalisation, she is creating her own cultural cartography (Sole, 2013). Que was very excited during the DMFonF
program. This is evidenced by her attendance rate of over 90% in the DMFonF sessions. She was able to attain from the single-word stage (Stage 1) at pre-test to the phrasal plural agreement with definite and indefinite quantifiers (Stage 3).

Lis sometimes speaks English with Vit. Lis’s daughter also speaks English with her older sister who graduated from this kindergarten and her relative, for example, please. Lis’s daughter likes to sing some English songs that she already knows. This means that Lis tried to build an English environment in her family. Lis’s daughter receives full support from the family member as well as the relative.

As his father cannot speak Indonesian, Vik’s son, Aqi, often speaks English with his stepfather who originally came from America. Therefore, his father is the main literacy sponsor (Brandt, 1998) at home. Ast’s son, Fak, sometimes speaks English words such as amazing and good. She has taught Fak some English words. This means that Fak’s mother is the main literacy sponsor of the child.

When Win is asked about the practice of English at home, she says:

Yes, she sometimes speaks English with me but not with her younger brother. I think with her grandfather. Sometimes when he wants to speak with Zai, he said: “Come on speak English with me, my dear”. Sometimes we must encourage her to speak English. Sometimes I use English if I want to ask her to do something.

Win sometimes speaks English with her daughter, Zai. Win notices that Zai sometimes speaks English with her grandfather although she does not live together with him. Thus, Win and the grandfather are the literacy sponsors for Zai.

**Provision of tools and material**

Most parents in this study support their children in speaking English at home by providing some tools and materials in literacy such as storybooks, audio or video CD.
Moreover, they also allow their children to watch English videos for children on YouTube.

Did provides his daughter with a few storybooks in English and some CDs in English to learn English at home. Eli’s son likes watching YouTube in English about animals and singing songs. Eli gives access to literacy through sharing media such as YouTube. This can encourage her child to learn English at home in a fun way.

Aep’s daughter also likes watching English videos on the mobile phone and reading English storybooks at home. Aep facilitates his child to learn English in an informal situation. He provides the tools and materials such as mobile phones, iPad, storybooks, etc. It may prove that Aep’s daughter is very interested in learning English. It is one way to sponsor literacy development.

Lis’s daughter likes to sing some English songs that she already knows. This means that Lis tries to build an English environment in her family. Lis’s daughter receives full support from the family member, as well as the relative. This may be because English is quite familiar in this family. This situation can encourage Lis’s daughter to learn English at home. Similarly, Ast’s son also likes to sing English songs on CD and read a simple English book. Ast provides some literacy materials for the children learning English at home.

Vik’s son sometimes watches English movie cartoons on cable TV. This means that the parents support him in learning English at home by providing him a cable TV with many English programs.

Win’s daughter often watches Disney Channel shows such as *Dr. McStuffin* on cable TV and *Peppa Pig* on YouTube. Zai’s family provide a broad range of literacy opportunities for her to learn English by accessing cable TV and allowing her to watch YouTube. Zai’s family might try to build an English environment in this family.
because they have an idea of transnational language learning (Solé, 2013). This family has been aware of the importance of learning English for quite some time so that transnationalism (Solé, 2013) has become the way of life for them.

In summary, most parents in this study sometimes speak English words and expressions with their children. This means that these parents support the children to speak English at home. They are the main literacy sponsors of their children. Some parents provide the children with some literacy materials and electronic devices to support the children learning English at home. Also, a few parents allow the children to watch YouTube to support the children learning English at home. This might happen because these parents try to build the English environment at home.

6.4 Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter aims to investigate the teacher’s and parents’ perceptions of the English L2 program at the kindergarten. It appears that teacher and parental perceptions of the English L2 program are mainly positive.

The interview results with the teacher reveal that she felt the difference in teaching English lessons before and after implementing the DMFonF program. She taught the same lesson plan for a semester in the meaning-based classes. When the DMFonF intervention began for three months, she added the linguistic syllabus, which focused on the plural form structures to her classes. At the beginning of the semester with the DMFonF program, she was nervous and worried that she could not teach English plural structures to the children. Sarah also thought that the children could not follow the lesson. Surprisingly, after a month with the DMFonF program, her self-confidence was increased, and the children were able to learn lexical plural. She used
flashcards in teaching English plural to encourage children to speak English. She felt that the program was especially useful. After the DMFonF program was over, the children were able to learn English lexical and phrasal plural. She felt that teaching English grammar implicitly to the children was not difficult. Even though there were some children who could not concentrate on receiving the English plural lesson, the program was still implemented, and she often changed her teaching strategies to create a fun language learning environment in the classroom.

The findings of parental perceptions toward the English L2 program in the kindergarten are drawn from both questionnaires and interviews. It can be concluded from the data collected that parents’ main reason and motivation for sending their child to a school that has the English L2 program is associated with the high value of English for the children and the importance of learning English for a later career or studies.

The participating parents in this study are from middle-class backgrounds who reflect differing forms of cosmopolitanism regarding early foreign language education for their children. Parents assume cosmopolitanism as a form of cultural and social capital. Parental expectation from this program is that they want their children to gain knowledge English skills, such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing, at an early age. Therefore, in the future, the children will be able to master English and be successful in their lives.

In terms of Weenink’s (2008) notion of two types of cosmopolitan parents from the interview data, some parents are categorised as dedicated and some of them as pragmatic cosmopolitan. Both dedicated and pragmatic cosmopolitans are ambitious for their children (Weenink, 2008). The dedicated cosmopolitan parents have various experiences in dealing with English. They share the same purposes that they want their children to engage with others and think more broadly (Weenink, 2008). This means
that the parents may try to teach the children to be flexible and open-minded in the
global world. The pragmatic cosmopolitan parents often have an international
perspective in their way of life. However, they emphasise the benefit of learning
English for the children for a later career or studies (Weenink, 2008).

Based on the questionnaire results, the participating parents in the study indicate
their child’s first language is Indonesian, except for Pan from K1 whose L1 is
Sundanese. The children’s second languages are varied. Some children have local
languages as their L2, and a few children have English as their L2. However, it does
not mean that the children whose L2 are English can speak English actively. Parents’
answers in the questionnaire regarding their child’s L2 are based on their assumptions
about the language acquired after the first language.

All parents mainly speak Indonesian. In terms of literacy sponsors, they rarely
speak English with their children at home. There are some family members, such as
siblings and the grandfather, and relatives who can speak English, who become the
sponsors of literacy of the children. The literacy sponsor in the family is limited to the
use of English words and language expressions.

Parents’ efforts to create an English environment at home need to be appreciated.
However, it may take a longer period to acquire English in the natural setting in
Indonesia. This is because English in Indonesia is a foreign language and is not used
as a medium of communication in everyday life (Lauder, 2008).

To build an English language environment at home, the provision of materials
and tools is needed. Based on the questionnaire and interview results, all parents allow
the children to use materials and tools to learn English at home. However, the levels
of intensity of using these materials and tools are different. Most parents allow their
children to use the materials and tools occasionally. Only a few parents respond a few
times per week and almost every day regarding the use of materials and tools to learn English at home. This means that the children in this study receive little English input at home.
CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION

This chapter concludes the current study on the lexical and grammatical development in English in Indonesian kindergarten children within Processability Theory (PT). This study also examines the linguistic environment the teacher provided in terms of Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form (DMFonF) instruction and feedback as well as the teacher’s and parents’ perceptions of the children learning English L2 at the kindergarten. This concluding chapter first summarises the findings relating to the research questions. This summary is followed by the theoretical and practical implications of this study. Finally, this chapter identifies the contributions of the study to the field of knowledge and limitations of the study and concludes with suggestions for future research.

7.1 Summary findings relating to research questions

The primary aim of this thesis is to examine lexical and grammatical development using a DMFonF instruction component focusing on the acquisition of English plural marking -s on nouns in Indonesian kindergarten children within a PT framework. In achieving this aim, a longitudinal quasi-experimental classroom-based study was conducted with four-to-six-year-old Indonesian kindergarten children over one school semester. The findings relating to the research questions in this thesis are summarised as follows. The first two questions are related to linguistic analyses and the last question is related to qualitative analyses.
1. **How effective is the Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form (DMFonF) intervention in the meaning-based English L2 kindergarten program with younger children in an Indonesian multilingual context?**

Answers to the research questions through this study are summarised according to the three sub-questions a) – c).

a) **What lexical and grammatical development did the kindergarten children develop in English L2 before the DMFonF intervention?**

In terms of the lexical acquisition, the pre-test (Time 1) results reveal that all children in K1 and K2 produced nouns and adjectives, except for Kia from K1. Kin from K1 and Zai from K2 produced the highest lexical types at Time 1. Zai was the only child who could produce verbs. The results show that K2 children, who were in the last semester of the second year of kindergarten, had a richer lexicon than K1 children, who were at the beginning of their second semester in the first year of kindergarten.

Regarding the grammatical acquisition, except for Kin and Zai, children in both K1 and K2 were not able to produce noun phrases consisting of a noun plus modifier(s) at Time 1. Both Zai and Kin seemed to be more advanced in English than other children in both groups before the DMFonF program started. For plural development, all children in both groups were not able to produce lexical or phrasal plurals. Thus, the children were at the Lemma access/single word stage (Stage 1) in PT. This finding indicates that a communicative meaning-based English program may promote lexical learning but not grammatical learning.

b. **Does the DMFonF intervention promote English lexical and grammatical development in kindergarten children?**
After receiving three months of DMFonF intervention in their meaning-based English program, at the post-test (Time 2), the K1 and K2 children had progressed from the Lemma access (Stage 1) to the Category (Stage 2) and Phrasal procedure stage (Stage 3) in PT. In terms of lexical acquisition, most children in K1 and K2 produced nouns, adjectives, and definite quantifiers. Zah from K1 and Aqa from K2 were the exceptions. Zah did not produce definite or indefinite quantifiers and Aqa only produced nouns at Time 2.

In terms of grammatical acquisition, most children in K1 and K2 produced a range of nominal syntactic structures with noun heads with an adjective and/or definite quantifier. Again, Zah and Aqa did not produce any noun phrases at Time 2. For plural development, all children in both groups attained the lexical plural stage (Stage 2) and 17 children, eight from K1 and nine from K2, attained the phrasal plural stage (Stage 3). Within the noun phrase, plural agreement of a noun with a definite quantifier was acquired before indefinite quantifiers. The hypothesis of the study is supported. The results indicate that the DMFonF instruction in the English L2 kindergarten program is effective. This finding suggests that some form of DMFonF intervention in the classroom may promote L2 lexical and grammatical development.

The delayed post-test, i.e., six months after the post-test, was conducted cross-sectionally with 15 children, eight from K1 and seven from K2, to assess whether the children still maintained their English lexical and grammatical knowledge. The children’s lexical and grammatical development in both groups was unstable. In terms of lexical development, most children (n=11) produced fewer lexical types at the delayed post-test than at the post-test. Only a few children (n=4) produced more lexical types at the delayed post-test than at the post-test.
In grammatical development, some children in both groups were still able to produce NP, except for Dan from K2, who produced single nouns. In terms of plural development, three children were still at the single word stage (Stage 1); two children were at the lexical plural stage (Stage 2); the remaining 10 children were at the phrasal plural stage (Stage 3). Some children were able to produce phrasal but not lexical plural at Time 3. This is because these children did not produce plural marked nouns in isolation but did so with adjectives or determiners. Therefore, this does not reflect their longitudinal developmental sequence because all of them had already acquired the lexical plural earlier.

c) Does the children’s development follow the developmental trajectory predicted by PT?

The children’s lexical and grammatical development in this study follows the developmental trajectory predicted by PT. The results with Indonesian kindergarten children are compatible with previous PT studies involving different L1 learners. The results closely resemble those obtained by Di Biase (2002, 2008) with primary school children learning Italian L2 in Australia. Such cross-linguistic comparisons in L2 learning are made possible by the common metrics provided by PT.

In summary, this study suggests that the DMFonF program significantly benefited the children’s lexical and grammatical development. However, the English L2 program had to continue to provide English input to promote and maintain children’s lexical and grammatical development.

To identify how the teacher taught English L2 to the children in the communicative meaning-based classroom, this study observed the teacher’s linguistic behaviour before and during the implementation of the DMFonF program, which led to the following second research question.
2. **What kind of linguistic environment did the teacher provide in terms of DMFonF instruction and feedback?**

The second question in this study is related to the linguistic environment the teacher provided in terms of DMFonF instruction and feedback. The analyses found that before applying the DMFonF program, the teacher used six out of 12 categories such as Q (asks questions); +FB (positive feedback); RR (request repetition); and verbal CUE, which corroborated the children’s linguistic output. However, the teacher did not use {R (recast) and negative feedback such as {RW (+) (Repeat wrong form), {CL (Clarification request), and EC(+)) (explicit correction) to draw children’s attention to errors. The teacher also did not provide the correct forms when the children made errors.

During the three months with the DMFonF program, the teacher used the same nine out of 12 categories in the K1 and K2 classes. The three most used categories were Q, +FB and RR (request repetition). This suggests the more feedback categories the teacher uses the more it might promote L2 acquisition. In summary, DMFonF instruction and feedback enables the teacher to create more opportunities in using grammatical rule application rather than leading the children to sing songs and listen to storytelling. The DMFonF program also creates opportunities to gauge any increase in language accuracy.

Another aim of this study is to explore teacher’s and parents’ perceptions of the children learning English, as well as the degree of family support for their children to learn English at home. To achieve this aim, the questionnaire with parents and interviews with a teacher and parents were conducted. In the following, the findings relating to the research question are summarised.
3. **What are the teacher’s and parents’ perceptions towards the English L2 program at the kindergarten?**

The third question is related to qualitative analysis of the questionnaire and interviews. The first part of the question sought to understand the teacher’s perceptions in implementing the DMFonF program based on three interview sessions. The results reveal that before the DMFonF program began, the teacher prepared lesson plans, which focused on vocabulary learning and expressions, based on the school curriculum. The teacher added the lesson about English plural forms in the meaning-based English L2 program. The teacher prepared various teaching materials such as flashcards, storybooks, and toys. She also created some games using flashcards for teaching vocabulary. She was anxious during the first interview that she would not be able to deliver the program successfully to the children.

In the second interview, after one month of using the DMFonF program, the teacher felt the program was working well and was easy to apply. She applied some strategies to encourage children to speak English in the classroom by using flashcards. However, she found that the K1 children were very slow and had difficulties concentrating on receiving the lesson compared to the K2 children. This was despite the K1 children receiving the English L2 program in the morning when children tend to be more active. The K2 children received the program in the afternoon after lunchtime and they were often exhausted during this time.

In the last interview after the DMFonF program was over, the teacher reflected on her teaching experiences using the DMFonF instruction. She never thought that she could teach English plural forms implicitly to the children. Her strategies to create the language environment of the target language in the classroom and attract the interest of the children to speak English included playing games with flashcards and watching
YouTube videos in English. She found that teaching English lexical and phrasal plural was particularly challenging. Therefore, she often changed her teaching strategies in the K1 and K2 classrooms so the children could more easily understand the lesson.

The research question also asked parents’ perceptions towards the English L2 program at the kindergarten based on the questionnaire and interview analysis. The questionnaires were completed by 20 parents of children participating in this study. Most parents were very practical in supporting their children to learn English L2. The analysis found that they wanted their children to acquire English L2 for a later career and study. Based on the questionnaire results, most parents had ambitions to equip their children with cosmopolitan capital regarding the choice of school and their expectations from the kindergarten English L2 program (Bourdieu, 1986; as detailed in Chapter 6). Nine parents had explicit ambitions for their children to possess social, cultural, and particularly linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1986). The parents believed that acquiring linguistic capital, specifically learning English from an early age, would heighten their children’s social and cultural capital and promote opportunities in later life.

The parents’ perceptions reflect Weenink’s (2008) two types of cosmopolitan parents, pragmatic cosmopolitan and dedicated cosmopolitan parents, as defined in Chapter 3. Five parents align as pragmatic cosmopolitan and four parents as dedicated cosmopolitan parents. Pragmatic and dedicated cosmopolitan parents have similarities in that they are ambitious for their children to have an international orientation for their children’s future life (Weenink, 2008). Dedicated cosmopolitan parents aspire for their children to explore the world, to engage with other foreign cultures, to be flexible and open-minded. Meanwhile, pragmatic cosmopolitan parents want their children to acquire international orientation but do not want to relate this to the world that is open.
to exploring. They emphasise the benefit of international orientation for future careers or studies.

It is striking that in terms of literacy sponsors all parents in this study rarely spoke English with their children at home, mainly speaking Indonesian with them. Some family members who could speak English, such as siblings, grandparents, and other relatives sometimes acted as sponsors of literacy. All parents allowed their children to use materials and tools to learn English at home although the frequency varied. Most parents permitted their children to use the materials and tools only occasionally. Only a few parents allowed their children to use the materials and tools a few times per week and/or every day at home. This indicates the children are infrequently exposed to or used English at home.

Overall, this study suggests the three months with the DMFonF L2 English program was effective. Children’s lexical and grammatical knowledge developed significantly after the implementation of the DMFonF program from Stage 1 (single word/formulaic) to Stage 2 (lexical) and Stage 3 (phrasal) in PT. The teacher’s linguistic input, feedback and interaction were also crucial for the children to acquire the L2 in the classroom. The results confirm instructed L2 learning with the DMFonF program is suitable for the Indonesian context. Teacher’s and parents’ perceptions, towards the English L2 program were positive.

7.2 Contributions of the study

The present study makes several contributions to the field of SLA and L2 teaching and learning. First, this study contributes to obtaining new evidence on a longitudinal study of English lexical and grammatical development in the context of Indonesian kindergarten children. As reviewed in Chapter 3, most SLA research has been
conducted cross-sectionally with child and adult learners (e.g., Dulay and Burt, 1973, 1974a; Bailey, et.al., 1974). However, longitudinal studies of SLA of children and adults are rare (Doughty & Long, 2003). Longitudinal studies are crucial to identify real language development, while cross-sectional studies can lend support to generalise the results gained through longitudinal studies. Thus, this longitudinal study over a six-month period, involving Indonesian kindergarten children in instructed English L2, contributes valuable evidence to the field of SLA.

Second, this study broaches the issue of learning efficacy in the classroom and shows the benefits to kindergarten children in learning an L2. Third, it promotes teachers’ awareness of L2 structures and teaching strategies, e.g., what to teach, when, and what to focus on in giving feedback. A further contribution of the study is the evidence that parents’ support and motivation for their children to learn English L2 can increase their children’s capital.

7.3 Theoretical and practical implications of the study

This study has theoretical implications for instructed SLA, particularly Processability Theory. First, it provides evidence for the effect of DMFonF instruction and feedback (Di Biase 2002, 2008) within a PT framework (Pienemann, 1998, 2005a; Pienemann, et al, 2005). It also provides evidence on the development of plural marking in English L2 in Indonesian kindergarten children with L1 without morphological plural, characterised by optional classifiers.

This is the first longitudinal study of Indonesian kindergarten children learning English L2 using the DMFonF instruction and feedback within the PT framework. As reviewed in Chapter 3, most longitudinal BFLA (e.g., Itani-Adams, 2007; Mohamed Salleh et. al., 2016) and child SLA (e.g., Yamaguchi, 2010) studies have been
conducted in natural settings. In contrast, this study was conducted in an instructed L2 classroom setting, specifically, an Indonesian kindergarten classroom, which contributes valuable evidence to the field of instructed SLA. Thus, the study clarifies the role of second language instruction from a theoretical viewpoint.

This study’s practical implication lies in its DMFonF strategies. For example, recast in the meaning-based second language classrooms can be utilised to promote and speed up lexical and grammatical development. Thus, DMFonF instruction is more effective in kick-starting L2 grammatical development beyond lexical learning than purely meaning-based instruction.

This study impacts the field of early English education and has helped inspire other researchers in ESL among children. For example, learning from earlier versions of this study, researchers in Malaysia investigated the effect of DMFonF instruction among pre-school children (Uzir & Mohamed Salleh, 2020), as well as on autistic children learning English L2 (Sabri & Mohamed Salleh, 2020).

7.4 Limitation of the study and recommendations for further study

This study has some limitations. The first relates to the generalisability of the results, as this study only examined a single kindergarten L2 classroom. More longitudinal studies in instructed English L2 learning on Indonesian kindergarten children are indicated so that the generalisation of the results in this study can be extended. Secondly, this study did not look in detail at the teacher’s language when engaging in the macro-categories of linguistic behaviour. Rather, it concentrated on the observation when the teacher provided feedback on the form being focused on and disregarded other linguistic errors that were not relevant. Future studies are required to discover possible correlations between macro-categories of linguistic behaviour and
FonF. Thirdly, this study did not centre on the parents’ attitudes towards learning English L2 for their children, as its focus was on the children’s language development. This issue is beyond the current study's scope, and further study is indicated to ascertain parental involvement in acquiring early English L2 at home.

Finally, it is hoped the recommendations made by this study will help improve kindergarten English programs, thus contributing to English education in a linguistically complex situation such as Indonesia, a country that promotes learning English from an early age.
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Appendix 1. Sample tasks to measure children’s lexical and grammatical development

Lexical plural marking

*apple* and *apples*

![Image of apples](https://www.frescobroome.com/shop/red-apples-1kg)

(Source: image ‘apple’ [https://www.frescobroome.com/shop/red-apples-1kg](https://www.frescobroome.com/shop/red-apples-1kg))

(Source: image ‘apples’ [https://www.osfhealthcare.org/blog/apples-keep-more-than-doctor-away/](https://www.osfhealthcare.org/blog/apples-keep-more-than-doctor-away/))

*banana* and *yellow bananas*

![Image of bananas](https://time.com/5730790/banana-panama-disease/)


(Source: image ‘yellow bananas’ [https://cosmosmagazine.com/biology/can-bananas-kill-you/](https://cosmosmagazine.com/biology/can-bananas-kill-you/))
Phrasal plural marking

one blue star

five blue stars

one green mango

a lot of green mangos

(Source: image ‘one green mango’
http://www.nandyala.org/mahanandi/archives/2006/03/26/maamidikaya-raw-mango/)

(Source: image ‘a lot of green mangos’ https://www.asianet.in/house-making/know-these-ways-to-ripen-green-mangoes-at-home-easily.html)
Appendix 2. Transcription Conventions and Samples of transcription


1. Decide first the **speaker notation (or code)** for each participant in the conversation e.g.:

   C = facilitator/researcher.

   T = your informant (keep confidentiality by giving him/her a fictitious name/code)

   Use upper case (capital letters) for the speaker codes which are UNLIKELY to appear in the actual production text e.g., avoid using ‘I’ as code for a speaker in an English text, as it will be confused with the first-person pronoun. Avoid ‘A’ because it may be confused with articles etc.

2. After typing in the speaker code enter only a tab (i.e. press the <tab> key on the computer’s keyboard). No other characters (only a tab character) should be written between the speaker code and the beginning of turn for that speaker. This allows the computer to identify unambiguously each turn and speaker.

   After the first speaker notation and tab are entered, start transcribing what you hear on the tape player. Continue writing on a linear basis from left to right until the end of **turn** of that speaker.

   But what is a **turn**?

   **Turn** here refers to a normally continuous (including pauses) utterance of a speaker, until the Interlocutor (i.e., the other participant in the interaction) either takes his/her turn where he/she judges to be the end of the first speaker’s utterance or interrupts the first speaker’s utterance to take his/her turn.
3. At the end of the turn press the **return key**. Then, again (new speaker) write **speaker notation**, **tab key**, write turn and hit the **return key** at the end of the turn. E.g.:

**C** what did you say your name was? I did not hear what you said the first time

**T** it’s difficult to spell

4. There should be **no punctuation marks except for question marks** when the speaker appears to indicate a question (e.g., by rising intonation) as in example above.

5. **No capital letters** except for **proper names** of people and places and the pronoun for the first person singular ‘I’ and the expression **OK**. e.g.

**C** are you **OK** now?

(notice that there is no capital letter at the beginning of turns and no full stop at the end)

6. **Pauses** are indicated by one dot (corresponding roughly to a hesitation pause or a pause usually represented by a comma in ordinary writing) or two dots if it is a longish pause (corresponding roughly to a full stop pause in ordinary writing). If there is a pause longer than those two, just write (long pause) in brackets. e.g.

**T** um … he um want to buy a … computer but he lost money and …um (long pause) I don’t know

7. Standardise **discourse/feedback sounds marking** (i.e., assign the same string of characters to the same marking) e.g., hesitation (um, uh, er), confirmation and back channeling cues (mhm), clarification requests (mm?), mild surprise (oh). In general, it is best to use strings of characters that are NOT likely to be part of the text, such as ‘a’.
8. Write **numerals** in words (not figures).

9. Syllables which cannot be transcribed because the transcriber cannot hear or understand them are placed inside round brackets with an (X) for the unclear syllable or word and three Xs for longer stretches (XXX). Also, any other comment by the transcriber or any element that does not belong to the text produced by the informant or the interviewer will be enclosed in brackets e.g.

   T this one? (informant points to a picture on the wall)

10. Avoid any special formatting or special characters whatever (e.g., do not use diacritics, avoid accented vowels) in your transcript and make one copy of it (SAVE AS) Text Only (for analysis) and one with numbered turns (for reference, after you paste it on X-cel - see the section on ‘Processing your transcript’ below).

N.B. It is a good idea to make a backup copy of all your research files in a different disk.

The following is a short example of a transcription

(T = Informant; C = Researcher)

C OK so er the first thing we’ll do this morning is look at some pictures

T mhm

C and I’m going to ask you to tell me a story ... about the pictures here we have uh some pictures from a store ... with

T a store?

C a shopkeeper

T oh

C and we have some things that he does ... every day and I’d like you to tell me the story of what he does... in a day

236
(long pause) first hes… he clean er… her shop his shop er before open … mm. and then he … mm look (X) goods or things
C mhm
...

2.1 A short example of transcription lesson in K2 without DMFonF instruction and K1 group with DMFonF instruction

1. Short example of transcription in K2 group without DMFonF instruction

[T = Teacher; All = informant i.e., all children; Dan = informant (male); Aqi = informant (male); Fah = informant (male)]

T what colour (pointing out the book)
All purple
T good and now what is the colour of your uniform?
All yellow
T how about Dan’s jacket?
All orange
T orange and
All black
T and black … how about your hair?
All black
T black OK ada yang white gak rambutnya?
‘does anyone have a white hair?’
All no
T OK do you see this picture? (pointing out the picture in the book)
Aqi volcano
T OK what is this?
Fah the sun
T rooster OK and kira-kira ini lagi apa ya?
‘what is next?’
All  morning…good morning to you
T    good morning to you
All  good morning my dear friend, good morning to you
T    *kok teman-teman tahu itu lagi morning?*
     ‘how did you know that it was in the morning?’
All  *iya taulah*
     ‘of course…we know’
T    *ada apanya? ada matahari baru terbit*
     ‘what is it? the sun rises
All  yeah

2.  Short example of transcription in Group A with DMFonF instruction

[T = Teacher; All = informant i.e., all children; Kin = informant (female); Dac = informant (male); Fap = informant (male); Hai = informant (male)]

T    OK kids OK good morning kids
All  good morning Miss
T    how are you today?
All  I am fine Miss thank you and you
T    OK kids I have
Kin   a card
T    cards yes…now let’s count how many cards that I have?
All  one two three four five six
T    how many?
All   six
T    I have six cards…OK now let’s see what is this? first repeat after me OK
All   apple
T    apple (by showing the card with one apple to the children)
All   apple
T    apple, Dac. apple
Dac  apple
T    OK now apples
All   apples
T    apples
All   apples
T    apples
All  apples
T    Dacha apples
Dac  apples
T    eh Kin
Kin  apples
T    OK (looking at Fap)
Fak  elepes
T    apples
Fak  appes
T    apples
Fak  apples
Kin  apples
T    OK (looking at Hai)
Hai  apples
T    OK now the second card what is this?
Kin  strawberry
T    this is strawberry
All  strawberry
T    strawberry
All  strawberry
T    what is this? (looking at Kin)
Kin  strawberry

3. Short examples of transcription of one-on-one conversation in English between
   the researcher and a child at pre- and post-test

Zai from K2 at pre-test:

[R = Researcher; Zai = informant (female)]

R    OK. good morning…how are you?
Zai  I am fine
R    wah…what’s your name?
Zai  Zai
R    Zai. OK Zai…we are going to play with cards OK. now I will ask you a. what is in
     the picture and then you can answer it in English OK. OK. what is this?
Zai doggie
R dog good… and what are these?
Zai doggies
R yes… OK good
Zai but it is so many
R so many dogs right. wow. excellent. OK
Zai car
R car. what colour is this?
Zai yellow
R yellow good. and what are these?
Zai car. it is a lot
R a lot of cars, right? oh there are a lot of cars. OK. OK
Zai cat
R what. what is this?
Zai cats
R and what are these?
Zai cat and so many

Zai from K2 at post-test:

R how are you today?
Zai I am fine Miss
R OK good. today we are going to play
Zai cards
R please answer me in English OK. OK what is this?
Zai tomato
R yes good. and what is this?
Zai one blue square
R yes good. what are these?
Zai five blue stars
R good job. what are these?
Zai two blue bags
R yes, good what are these?
Zai four brown dogs
R yes. good Zai … what are these?
Zai two red apples
Appendix 3. Samples of concordance and wordlist from KWIC

Kin from K1 at post-test (Time 2)

Concordance

1) six yellow trucks, three yellow pineapples, a lot of brown cats, lots of brown dogs

1) eleven, twelve twelve .. twelve red roses a lot of oranges one green star lots of

1) four five six. six black chairs one green mango a lot of mangos one two three four five. five

1) five. five black pencils five yellow bananas a little more time mhm one two re four five six.

1) I am fine Miss Dini Kin four blue horts one blue

1) three orange…potatoes mhm mhm lots of red. apples four brown dogs

1) eight nine ten. ten. red backpacks one red. backpack lots of. lots of red tomatoes one.

1) four five six. seven eight nine ten. ten. red backpacks one. red. backpack lots of. lots of

1) three four five. five black pencils five yellow bananas a little more time mhm one two re four

1) brown monkeys one two three four five six. six black chairs one green mango a lot of

1) mangos one

1) a lot of mangos one two three four five. five black pencils five yellow bananas a little more

1) I am fine Miss Dini Kinara four blue horts one blue heart one. white cow two.

1) I am fine Miss Dini Kinara four blue horts one blue heart one white cow two. white cows one.

1) two. white cows one white duck four. colourful books four colourful. books five ... one two
white duck four. colourful books four colourful. books five ... one two three four five. six

trucks three. yellow. pineapples a lot of brown. cats lots. of. brown. dogs one. one

. pineapples a lot of brown. cats lots. of. brown. dogs one. one two. three. four. five.

oranges one green star lots of strawberries one brown ... red pencil two brown monkeys one
two

lots of strawberries one brown ... red pencil two brown monkeys one two four five. six

. nine ten. eleven twelve thirteen. thirteen. brown. potatoes one. two three. four five.

Wordlist:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apples</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backpack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backpacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bananas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>books</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colourful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cows</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dini</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>proper name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dogs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>token</td>
<td>part_of_speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eleven</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fifteen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourteen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>indefinite quantifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lots</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>indefinite quantifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mango</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mangos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4. Samples of lexical and phrasal plural -s
at post-test (Time 2)

4.1 Lexical plural production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Suppliance of plural marking -s</th>
<th>Oversupply plural marking -s in singular context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zah</td>
<td>hearts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ducks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>triangles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mangos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strawberries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>apples</td>
<td>white horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ducks</td>
<td>green mangos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orange carrots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blue hearts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niz</td>
<td>yellow bananas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brown horses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>red apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>red tomatoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orange oranges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>red strawberries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fap</td>
<td>red strawberries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orange oranges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sha</td>
<td>hearts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monkeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yellow bananas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>red strawberries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsa</td>
<td>red strawberries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orange oranges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>red apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hai  
cats  
horses  
red tomatoes  
yellow bananas  

Dac  
bananas  
balls  
dogs

### K2 Group at Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Suppliance of plural marking -s</th>
<th>Oversuppliance plural marking -s in singular context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aqa</td>
<td>oranges</td>
<td>hearts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strawberries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fah</td>
<td>bananas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>horses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monkeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pencils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>bananas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strawberries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>horses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orange oranges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>bags</td>
<td>blue triangles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pencils</td>
<td>brown dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monkeys</td>
<td>red strawberries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>green mangoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>white ducks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far</td>
<td>monkeys</td>
<td>red tomatoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que</td>
<td>cards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>white dogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqi</td>
<td>chairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Phrasal plural production

K1 Group at Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Suppliance of plural -s with definite or indefinite quantifiers</th>
<th>Oversupply plural marking -s in singular context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kia</td>
<td>two bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two ducks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niz</td>
<td>three stars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two white cows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fap</td>
<td>four monkeys</td>
<td>one red strawberries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>four white ducks</td>
<td>one orange carrots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two blue bags</td>
<td>one white ducks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>five pencils</td>
<td>one monkeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sha</td>
<td>two red apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>five orange carrots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>four white ducks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two red squares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsa</td>
<td>two monkeys</td>
<td>one red tomatoes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
five pencils
two blue bags
four yellow bananas

Pan
four books
three green hearts
five orange carrots
two brown monkeys

Hai
two birds
eight elephants
three orange pumpkins
three yellow pineapples

Dac
four books
two butterflies
two green mangos
four blue hearts

Kin
four colourful books
nine brown horses
lots of strawberries
a lot of brown cats

---

**K2 Group at Time 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Suppliance of plural -s with definite or indefinite quantifiers</th>
<th>Oversuppliance plural marking -s in singular context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fah</td>
<td>two mangos</td>
<td>one stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two stars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>four hearts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>three tables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>two brown cows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>five blue stars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>six black chairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>three yellow pineapples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>four ducks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>four blue triangles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far</td>
<td>two blue bags</td>
<td>one white horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>five orange carrots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que</td>
<td>a lot of oranges, a lot of carrots, three tables, six blue chairs, a lot of bags, a lot of red tomatoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqi</td>
<td>four books, two white stars, a lot of brown dogs, a lot of green stars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raf</td>
<td>four dogs, four squares, three green hearts, two yellow stars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vit</td>
<td>four books, three tables, two white cows, four blue squares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zai</td>
<td>five balls, four balloons, three black stars, four brown dogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5. Questionnaire for parents

5.1 Questionnaire in English


Please provide the following information by ticking (✓) in the box or writing your response in the space.

**Part 1 Background**

1. Please write your child’s full name : 
2. Please write your child’s date and place of birth : 
3. Please write your full name : 
4. Please write your date and place of birth : 
5. What is your highest level of education? : 
6. What is your occupation? : 
7. What is your relationship with your child? : 
8. What is your first language? : 
9. What is your second language? : 
10. What is your child’s first language? : 
11. What is your child’s second language? : 

Part 2 Language use at home

12. What language do you mainly speak at home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language spoken</th>
<th>with spouse</th>
<th>with children</th>
<th>with relatives</th>
<th>nobody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others (please specify your answer):

13. Does your child speak English at home? Yes or No

If yes, with whom:

Part 3 Choice of school

14. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement about your reasons for sending your child to a school that has an English program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I want my child to speak English from a young age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I want my child to have international opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I want my child to be able to study abroad in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I want my child to be well informed and alert to cultural differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My other children can speak basic English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I want my child to prepare for English classes later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other reasons (please specify):
Part 4 Provision of tools and material

15. Which of the following programs or devices does your child use to learn English at home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Programs or devices</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>A few times per week</th>
<th>Almost everyday</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English TV program made in Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English TV program made in English speaking countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English videos such as Finding Nemo, My Little Pony, The Good Dinosaur, Postman Pat, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>English audios such as an audiobook or children’s song audio CD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Electronic devices such as smart phone and tablet equipped with English learning apps for kids (e.g., Lingokids, English for kids)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>English books such as storybook, activities book, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Website for sharing video such as YouTube, Me Tube, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>English games such as online learning games, English learning apps, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other devices (please specify):
Part 5 Parents’ expectations

16. What do you expect from the English program at the kindergarten?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Parents’ expectations</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To great extent</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Child will learn English vocabularies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Child will develop good English pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Child will gain good basic conversation such as greetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Child will acquire good reading skills in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Child will be able to write in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Child will understand spoken English such as English TV program, videos, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other expectations (please specify):
5.2 Questionnaire in Indonesian

Mohon isi kuesioner berikut dengan mencentang (√) dalam kotak atau tulis respon Anda pada bagian yang telah disediakan.

Bagian 1 Latar belakang

1. Mohon tuliskan nama lengkap anak Anda :
2. Mohon tuliskan tempat dan tanggal lahir anak Anda :
3. Mohon tuliskan nama lengkap Anda :
4. Mohon tuliskan tempat dan tanggal lahir Anda :
5. Apa pendidikan terakhir Anda? :
6. Apa pekerjaan Anda? :
7. Apa hubungan Anda dengan anak Anda :
8. Apa bahasa pertama Anda? :
9. Apa bahasa kedua Anda? :
10. Apa bahasa pertama Anak Anda? :
11. Apa bahasa kedua anak Anda? :

Bagian 2 Penggunaan bahasa di rumah

12. Bahasa apa yang sering Anda digunakan di rumah?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bahasa yang digunakan</th>
<th>dengan pasangan</th>
<th>dengan anak</th>
<th>dengan saudara</th>
<th>tidak dengan siapa-siapa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa Sunda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa Inggris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidak ada jawaban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lainnya (mohon jelaskan secara spesifik): 

13. Apakah anak Anda berbicara dengan bahasa Inggris di rumah? Iya atau Tidak
    Jika iya, dengan siapa:
**Bagian 3 Pemilihan Sekolah**

14. Mohon isi seberapa besar Anda menyetujui atau tidak menyetujui pada setiap pernyataan berikut mengenai alasan Anda untuk menyekolahkan anak Anda di sekolah yang terdapat program bahasa Inggris.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Alasan</th>
<th>Sangat tidak setuju</th>
<th>Tidak setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat setuju</th>
<th>Tidak ada jawaban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Saya ingin anak saya dapat berbicara bahasa Inggris sejak usia dini.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Saya ingin anak saya memiliki kesempatan untuk go international</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Saya ingin anak saya mampu melanjutkan studi di luar negeri.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Saya ingin anak saya mengetahui informasi terkini dan peka terhadap perbedaan budaya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Anak saya yang lain dapat berbicara bahasa Inggris.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Saya ingin anak saya siap untuk menjalani kelas bahasa Inggris di masa yang akan datang.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ada alasan lain (mohon tulis dengan spesifik)

**Bagian 4 Penyediaan alat dan media**

15. Program atau alat apakah yang anak Anda gunakan untuk mempelajari bahasa Inggris di rumah?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Program atau alat</th>
<th>Tidak pernah</th>
<th>Kadang-kadang</th>
<th>Beberapa kali per minggu</th>
<th>Hampir setiap hari</th>
<th>Tidak ada jawaban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

254
1 Program televisi berbahasa Inggris buatan Indonesia
2 Program televisi bahasa Inggris buatan negara asing berbahasa Inggris.
4 Audio berbahasa Inggris seperti buku audio atau CD lagu anak berbahasa Inggris.
5 Alat elektronik seperti 'smart phone dan tablet' yang dilengkapi Apps pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris untuk anak-anak (contoh: Lingokids dan English for kids)
6 Buku berbahasa Inggris seperti buku cerita, buku aktivitas, dan lain-lain.
7 Website untuk sharing video seperti YouTube, MeTube, dan lain-lain.
8 Permainan berbahasa Inggris seperti permainan pembelajaran online, aplikasi pembelajaran berbahasa Inggris, dan lain-lain.

Ada alat lainnya (mohon tuliskan secara spesifik):

**Bagian 5 Harapan para orang tua**

16. Apa yang Anda harapkan dari Program Bahasa Inggris di TK?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Harapan orang tua</th>
<th>Tidak sama sekali</th>
<th>Sangat sedikit</th>
<th>untuk taraf tertentu</th>
<th>untuk taraf yang besar</th>
<th>Tidak ada jawaban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anak akan belajar kosakata bahasa Inggris.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anak akan memiliki pelafalan bahasa Inggris yang baik.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anak akan memiliki percakapan dasar bahasa Inggris yang baik seperti menyapa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anak akan memiliki kemampuan membaca bahasa Inggris yang baik.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Anak akan mampu menulis dalam bahasa Inggris.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anak akan memahami bahasa Inggris lisan seperti program televisi berbahasa Inggris, video, dan lain-lain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ada harapan lain (mohon tuliskan dengan spesifik)
Appendix 6. Semi-structured interviews questions with a teacher and parents

6.1 Semi-structured interview with a teacher

*Interview 1 - Before the DMFonF program*

The first interview asked four questions about how the kindergarten children learnt English L2 before the introduction of the DMFonF program.

- Why do you think about parents put their children in kindergarten to learn English L2?
- How do you teach English?
- What do you plan for this semester?
- Can you give me some ideas of what you expect that will happen in English classes?

*Interview 2: In the middle of the DMFonF program*

The second interview asked four questions about the teacher’s experiences using the DMFonF instruction and feedback in the classroom.

- What is your opinion about doing the program using DMFonF instruction and feedback?
- What strategies might you use to encourage your students to speak English in your classroom?
- How do you engage your students in instruction and get them to use the target language?
- Do you think that using the DMFonF instruction is useful in your classroom?

*Interview 3: After the DMFonF program*

In the last interview, the teacher reflected on her teaching strategies and classroom practice. There were seven interview questions in the last interview as follows:

- How is it going with the program?
- How did you feel when you used this program in the classroom?
- What method did you use in your teaching?
- Did you change your strategies during the program?
- Did you use technology when you taught the lesson? If yes, give an example of how you used the technology
• Do you want to say something about this program?
• What are the most significant challenges in teaching and learning with the DMFonF program in the current classroom?

6.2 Semi-structured interview with parents

There are three points for the interview questions with parents, i.e., the choice of a preschool, the practice of English at home, and the motivation for the children learning L2.

Theme 1 The choice of pre-school
• Why did you choose the bilingual kindergarten?

Theme 2 The motivation for the children learning English
• What is your motivation for the children learning English?

Theme 3 The practice of English at home
• Do you speak English at home with your children?
## Appendix 7. Parents’ quotes in the interview relating to forms of capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Choice of school</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did</td>
<td>Yeah, you know that nowadays English is very important. Zah’s sister’s school recommended this kindergarten and also from Zah’s sister literacy course. There is a good kindergarten in our neighbourhood, but we decided to choose this school.</td>
<td>I might be interested in the school which has an English program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>Actually, I want to introduce a foreign language to my child because this is the best time for the child when she easily understands the basic things then in the future she will know about English.</td>
<td>I want my child’s academic achievement to develop in the classroom learning as well as social life with her friends to be independent, has a good moral value which is learned continuously, and knows the individual skill such as in art or other things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I choose this school because, firstly, it is an Islamic school. Secondly, the bilingual class. I am trying to introduce my child to a language other than Indonesian besides Indonesian as a daily language there is an English program in this school even though it is still simple.

It depends, for myself, I just want to introduce English to my child. I don't want to oblige him to learn English because he is still young.

Oh yeah because there is a bilingual program, and this is the Islamic school.

Well, I want my child to be more global, particularly English is needed in the future, so my motivation is that hopefully their English knowledge will be more advanced. They learn vocabulary items first in kindergarten then continue to learn how to give the
Aep

It will be more advanced than her parents. My English is not good, so I want my child to be smarter than me.

so that she will know the words that are often used if she meets people. If she can speak English, she will be able to speak with someone using English.

so that she can understand, and it would be not too monotonous with her own language.

Lis

Well, so that the children will have a broaden knowledge and their English knowledge will be more increased.

Vit will study at the integrated Islamic elementary school. I think in the integrated Islamic elementary school, the English lesson is becoming less compare to English bilingual school, but I will think about it. I want to see her interest. I will

Well, maybe we have been traveling to other countries so that I want my children in the future can socialize and think more broadly. I wish they can study
First, because this school is very close to our home. Second is I like the program in this school such as the Islamic study. The third is the bilingual program. Then this is a full-day school because I am working so I cannot accompany my son until the afternoon. So, I am looking for a school that can accommodate all of them starting from the Islamic study then he can learn English in the bilingual program then the motivation is I want my son to grow up to be smart, his morality is also good. Then his English knowledge is also good.
he can learn many positive activities until the afternoon when I go back home.

**Ast**

Besides it's very close to our house and there is a bilingual program, which introduces English from the early ages.

So that he knows English from the preschool age at least he recognises the letters, numbers that his mother has taught to him.

**Win**

Because there is a bilingual program because there is English. I think nowadays we need English so that she will not be left behind like her mother (laughing)

Well, I just think that nowadays English is very important for example if you want to continue your study in higher education you must take a TOEFL test. I learned English when I was at the university, I realised I really need English and when I met a foreign patient using English, I was so nervous, and I didn’t want to meet him. I don’t want my daughter like that. English is a universal language when we went to Singapore and Malaysia for holidays, she was excited and proud.
and her former school was Cambridge in Bandung.

in Junior High School and now I never learned English and I didn’t speak English at all at home at that time when I was at school there was no conversation class.

then she said: “Mom I heard English here”.

and her former school was Cambridge in Bandung.
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8.1 Consent form-Children

Consent Form – Parent/Carer

Project Title: Lexical and Grammatical Development in English as a Foreign Language in Indonesian Kindergarten Children

I, , hereby consent for my child , to participate in the above named research project. I have discussed participation in the project with my child and my child agrees to their participation in the project.

I acknowledge that:

• I have read the participant information sheet (or where appropriate, have had it read to me) and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my child’s involvement in the project with the researcher/s

• The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

I consent for my child to:

☐ Participate in an interview

☐ Having their information audio recorded

☐ Having their information video recorded

☐ Having their photo taken

I consent for my child’s data and information provided to be used in this project and, as long as the data is non-identified, in other related projects for an extended period of time.

I understand that my child’s involvement is confidential and that the information gained during the study may be published and stored for other research use but no information about them will be used in any way that reveals their identity.
I understand that I can withdraw my child, or my child can withdraw, from the study at any time without affecting their relationship with the researcher/s, and any organisations involved, now or in the future.

Signed:
Name:
Date:

This study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Western Sydney University. The ethics reference number is: IH03264

What if I have a complaint?
If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through Research Engagement, Development and Innovation (REDI) on Tel +61 2 4736 0229 or email humanethics@westernsydney.edu.au.
Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

8.2 Consent form-Parent/Carer

Consent Form – Parent or Carer

Project Title: Lexical and Grammatical Development in English as a Foreign Language in Indonesian Kindergarten Children

I, , hereby consent to participate in the above named research project.

I acknowledge that:

- I have read the participant information sheet (or where appropriate, have had it read to me) and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.
• The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

I consent to:

☐ Participating in an interview

☐ Participating in a survey

☐ Having my information audio recorded

☐ Having my photo taken

I consent for my data and information provided to be used in this project and other related projects for an extended period of time.

I understand that my involvement is confidential and that the information gained during the study may be published and stored for other research use but no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without affecting my relationship with the researcher/s, and any organisations involved, now or in the future.

Signed:
Name:
Date:

This study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Western Sydney University. The ethics reference number is: IH03264

What if I have a complaint?
If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through Research Engagement, Development
and Innovation (REDI) on Tel +61 2 4736 0229 or email humanethics@westernsydney.edu.au.

Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

8.3 Consent form-Teacher

Consent Form – Teacher

Project Title: Lexical and Grammatical Development in English as a Foreign Language in Indonesian Kindergarten Children

I, , hereby consent to participate in the above named research project.

I acknowledge that:

- I have read the participant information sheet (or where appropriate, have had it read to me) and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

- The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

I consent to:

☐ Participating in an interview

☐ Having my information audio recorded

☐ Having my information video recorded

☐ Having my photo taken

☐ Being contacted via phone call or email

I consent for my data and information provided to be used in this project and other related projects for an extended period of time.
I understand that my involvement is confidential and that the information gained during the study may be published and stored for other research use but no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without affecting my relationship with the researcher/s, and any organisations involved, now or in the future.

Signed:
Name:
Date:

This study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Western Sydney University. The ethics reference number is: IH03264

What if I have a complaint?
If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through Research Engagement, Development and Innovation (REDI) on Tel +61 2 4736 0229 or email humanethics@westernsydney.edu.au.

Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

8.4 Participant Information Sheet-Children

Participant Information Sheet – Parent/Carer

Project Title: Lexical and Grammatical Development in English as a Foreign Language in Indonesian Kindergarten Children

Project Summary: The present research investigates lexical and grammatical development in English as a foreign language in Indonesian kindergarten children resulting from the instruction in the English program. This quasi-experimental
research intends to record the children’s oral production of lexical items and grammatical structures. The children are from class groups: two groups at Level A (1st year), consisting of 4 to 5 years old (n=10) and two Level B (2nd year) groups consisting of 5 to 6 years old (n=10) children. All groups follow the meaning-based Kindergarten English program with Developmentally Moderated Focus on Form (DMFonF) and task-based instruction. However, in terms of feedback, both groups will follow DMFonF feedback procedure. To summarise, the goals of this study are examine the lexical items and grammatical forms that children produce from the pre-test, instruction, post-test and delayed post-test based on Processability Theory (PT) stages and analyse the differences between two groups.

Your child is invited to participate in a research study being conducted by Isriani Hardini, Ph.D. Candidate in Linguistics, School of Humanities and Communication Arts under the Supervision of A/Prof. Satomi Kawaguchi (Principal Supervisor), Prof. Carol Reid and A/Prof. Bruno Di Biase (Co-supervisors), School of Humanities and Communication Arts. The research is to investigate the lexical and grammatical development of English among Indonesian Kindergarten Children.

**How is the study being paid for?**
The study is being sponsored by Indonesian Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA) through support provided to the awardee of the MORA scholarship.

**What will my child be asked to do?**
Your child will be asked to do the four stages: pre-test, instruction, post-test and delayed post-test. The first stage is a pre-test to measure the baseline of the individual children about English single words, lexical plural and grammatical encoding relating noun phrase constructions and singular-plural expressions through audio recording. The second stage is an instruction program for 12 weeks which consists of two sessions per week with DMFonF instruction and feedback in both groups. Progress will be monitored through video and audio recording of each session. The third stage is the post-test to test the lexicon items and grammatical form of kindergarten children which may have acquired through the English program. This will be done individually with the children. The final stage is the delayed post-test, six months after the post-test, which will check whether the children still maintain the lexical items and grammatical structures learned from the program in the same format like the post-test.
How much of my child’s time will he/she need to give?
In the pre-test, your child will be interviewed by the researcher approximately 15-20 minutes in one session through audio recording. In the instruction English program, your child will receive the input from the teacher in the classroom which consist of two sessions (20-25 minutes) per week through video and audio recording for 12 weeks. In the post-test, your child will be tested by the researcher for about 15–20 minutes about the lexicon items and grammatical form which may have acquired through the English program. In the delayed post-test, your child will be interviewed by the researcher in the same format like the post-test.

What benefits will my child, and/or the broader community, receive for participating?
The study may bring long-term benefits to the community through science because there is very limited research done on English language development in Indonesian kindergarten children. We believe that this research might benefit the children to improve their English as a second or foreign language (L2). This program will help the children to attain their speech production especially in the aspects of lexical items and grammatical structures development.

Will the study involve any risk or discomfort for my child? If so, what will be done to rectify it?
We do not expect that your child will have a bad experience in this research as the research involves fun activities in the usual classroom. However, if your child feels uncomfortable during the recordings or the activities organized by the researcher, your child can ask the teacher or the researcher to stop at any time.

How do you intend to publish or disseminate the results?
It is anticipated that the results of this research project will be published and/or presented in a variety of forums. In any publication and/or presentation, information will be provided in such a way that the participant cannot be identified, except with your permission.

Will the data and information that my child provides be disposed of?
Only the researcher (Isriani Hardini) and her supervisory panel (A/Prof Satomi Kawaguchi, Prof Carol Reid and A/Prof Bruno Di Biase) will have authority to use or
access your child in this project. However, the data may be used in other related projects such as Post-Doctoral research in the next 5 years.

Can I withdraw my child from the study? Can my child withdraw from the study?

Your child’s participation in the study is entirely voluntary. Your child can choose if he/she wants to participate or not. Your child may withdraw from the study at any time and your child do not need to tell us why. If your child withdraws, all records of your child’s participation will be destroyed and further data will not be collected. However, the data that have been gained up until that point will not be destroyed and the data will be used for the researcher in the thesis.

Can I, or my child, tell other people about the study?

Yes, you or your child, can tell other people about the study by contacting Isriani Hardini as the Chief investigator to discuss their participation in the research project and obtain a copy of the information sheet.

What if I require further information?

Please contact Isriani Hardini should you wish to discuss the research further before deciding whether or not to participate.

- Isriani Hardini, PhD candidate, +61 414 340 819, email: 18490031@student.westernsydney.edu.au
- A/Prof Satomi Kawaguchi, Principal Supervisor, (+61) 29772 6567, email: S.Kawaguchi@student.westernsydney.edu.au
- Prof Carol Reid, Co-supervisor, (+61) 29772 6524, email: C.Reid@westernsydney.edu.au
- A/Prof Bruno Di Biase, Co-supervisor, (+61) 29772 6292, email: B.DiBiase@westernsydney.edu.au

What if I have a complaint?

If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through Research Engagement, Development and Innovation (REDI) on Tel +61 2 4736 0229 or email humanethics@westernsydney.edu.au.
Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

If you agree for your child to participate in this study, you may be asked to sign the Consent Form. The information sheet is for you to keep and the consent form is retained by the researcher/s.

This study has been approved by the Western Sydney University Human Research Ethics Committee. The Approval number is [enter approval number once the project has been approved].

8.5 Participant Information Sheet-Parent/Carer

**Participant Information Sheet – Parent/Carer**

**Project Title:** Lexical and Grammatical Development in English as a Foreign Language in Indonesian Kindergarten Children

**Project Summary:** The research aims are to investigate the language development in English as a foreign language (EFL) among Indonesian kindergarten children; examines the teacher’s strategies and practices in the classroom; analyse informal opportunities in the family and outside of the school for the children learning English. This project uses mixed methods including quantitative and qualitative. Quantitatively, this research uses a longitudinal, quasi-experimental classroom-based study. Qualitatively, this research uses semi-structured interview with teacher, interviews and questionnaires with parents. The participants involve 20 children from two levels of kindergarten, one Indonesian teacher and the children's parents. Expected outcomes are obtain new evidence on English lexical and grammatical development in Indonesian kindergarten children; benefit the students who are learning English; promotes teacher’s awareness in English structures and teaching strategies and; improve kindergarten English programs thus contributing to English education in Indonesia.
You are invited to participate in a research study being conducted by Isriani Hardini, Ph.D. Candidate in Linguistics, School of Humanities and Communication Arts under the Supervision of A/Prof. Satomi Kawaguchi (Principal Supervisor), Prof. Carol Reid and A/Prof. Bruno Di Biase (Co-supervisors), School of Humanities and Communication Arts. The research is to investigate the lexical and grammatical development of English among Indonesian Kindergarten Children.

**How is the study being paid for?**
The study is being sponsored by Indonesian Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA) through support provided to the awardee of the MORA scholarship.

**What will I be asked to do?**
You will be asked to fill in the questionnaire about ethnic and language background and English language exposure at home and other supports for the children learning English. Then, you will be interviewed about the reasons for choosing the specific kindergarten, the practice of English at home, and the motivations for wanting your child to learn English.

**How much of my time will I need to give?**
You can fill the questionnaire at home and collect it to the teachers within two weeks. The interview session will be held at school when you drop off and pick up your child from school for about 10 minutes and will be audio recorded with your consent.

**What benefits will I, and/or the broader community, receive for participating?**
The study may bring long-term benefits to the community through science because there is very limited research done on English language development in Indonesian kindergarten children. We believe that this research might benefit parents as they can learn more about children’s language development through information conversations with the researcher and access to the final thesis.

**Will the study involve any risk or discomfort for me? If so, what will be done to rectify it?**
We do not expect that you will have a bad experience in this research. However, if you feel uncomfortable when you fill the questionnaire and have an interview session, you can ask the researcher to stop at any time.

**How do you intend to publish or disseminate the results?**
It is anticipated that the results of this research project will be published and/or presented in a variety of forums. In any publication and/or presentation, information will be provided in such a way that the participant cannot be identified, except with your permission.

**Will the data and information that I have provided be disposed of?**

Only the researcher (Isriani Hardini) and her supervisory panel (A/Prof. Satomi Kawaguchi, Prof. Carol Reid and A/Prof. Bruno Di Biase) will have authority to use or access your child in this project. However, the data may be used in other related projects such as Post-Doctoral research in the next 5 years.

**Can I withdraw from the study?**

Your participation in the study is entirely voluntary. You can choose if you want to participate or not. You may withdraw from the study at any time and you do not need to tell us why. If you withdraw, all records of your participation will be destroyed and further data will not be collected. However, the data that have been gained up until that point will not be destroyed and the data will be used for the researcher in the thesis.

**Can I tell other people about the study?**

Yes, you or your child, can tell other people about the study by contacting Isriani Hardini as the Chief investigator to discuss their participation in the research project and obtain a copy of the information sheet.

**What if I require further information?**

Please contact Isriani Hardini should you wish to discuss the research further before deciding whether or not to participate.

- Isriani Hardini, Ph.D. candidate, +61 414 340 819, email: 18490031@student.westernsydney.edu.au
- A/Prof. Satomi Kawaguchi, Principal Supervisor, (+61) 29772 6567, email: S.Kawaguchi@student.westernsydney.edu.au
- Prof. Carol Reid, Co-supervisor, (+61) 29772 6524, email: C.Reid@westernsydney.edu.au
- A/Prof. Bruno Di Biase, Co-supervisor, (+61) 29772 6292, email: B.DiBiase@westernsydney.edu.au
What if I have a complaint?

If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through Research Engagement, Development and Innovation (REDI) on Tel +61 2 4736 0229 or email humanethics@westernsydney.edu.au.

Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

If you agree to participate in this study, you may be asked to sign the Participant Consent Form. The information sheet is for you to keep and the consent form is retained by the researcher/s.

This study has been approved by the Western Sydney University Human Research Ethics Committee. The Approval number is [enter approval number once the project has been approved].

8.5 Participant Information Sheet-Teacher

**Participant Information Sheet – Teacher**

**Project Title:** Lexical and Grammatical Development in English as a Foreign Language in Indonesian Kindergarten Children

**Project Summary:** The research aims are to investigate the language development in English as a foreign language (EFL) among Indonesian kindergarten children; examines the teachers’ strategies and practices in the classroom; analyse informal opportunities in the family and outside of the school for the children learning English. This project uses mixed methods including quantitative and qualitative. Quantitatively, this research uses a longitudinal, quasi-experimental classroom-based study (include experimental and control groups). Qualitatively, this research uses semi-structured interview with teacher; interviews and questionnaires with parents. The participants involve 20 children from two levels of kindergarten, one Indonesian teacher and the
children's parents. Expected outcomes are obtain new evidence on English lexical and grammatical development in Indonesian kindergarten children; benefit the students who are learning English; promotes teachers’ awareness in English structures and teaching strategies and; improve kindergarten English programs thus contributing to English education in Indonesia.

You are invited to participate in a research study being conducted by Isriani Hardini, Ph.D. Candidate in Linguistics, School of Humanities and Communication Arts under the Supervision of A/Prof. Satomi Kawaguchi (Principal Supervisor), Prof. Carol Reid and A/Prof. Bruno Di Biase (Co-supervisors), School of Humanities and Communication Arts. The research is to examine the teachers’ strategies and practices in the classroom.

**How is the study being paid for?**
The study is being sponsored by Indonesian Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA) through support provided to the awardee of the MORA scholarship.

**What will I be asked to do?**
You will be asked to have an interview with the researcher through conversation before the program begins about your lesson plans including the materials that you are going to use in this program. Then, as for the instruction in English L2 program during the semester, you will teach children according to the topics given by the kindergarten, for instance, ‘I know the Numbers’ and ‘Fruits and Vegetables’. You will also introduce appropriate vocabulary items to the children according to the topic. Examples of lexical items in the topic of ‘Fruit and Vegetables’ to be introduced can be *apple* (noun, singular), *banana, mango*, etc., and *apples* (plural). An example classroom activity can be as follows when introducing the concept of plurality. You will show the pictures of *one apple* and says the word *apple* and encourages the children to repeat the word. The same happens with pictures of other fruits (known by the children). After the children have mastered the names and can recall them in association with a picture then you show a picture of *many apples, many mangos*, etc. to the children and pronounces the respective plural forms (*apples, bananas*, etc.) and encourage the children to repeat.
Then, there will be a contrast between pictures showing one piece of a particular fruit and many pieces of the same fruit, and similarly for animals and other countable items. If you are in the experimental class, you will offer feedback only on the forms focused such as plural marking and noun phrase to the children. If you are in the control class, you will offer feedback on any perceived issue with the learner’s production, such as lexicon, pronunciation, grammar, usage and so on.

**How much of my time will I need to give?**

There will be four meetings of conversation with the researcher to before starting the program at school for about 30 minutes. In the instruction program, you will have two sessions (20-25 minutes of recordings) per week in the total of 12 weeks.

**What benefits will I, and/or the broader community, receive for participating?**

The study may bring long-term benefits to the community through science because there is very limited research done on English language development in Indonesian kindergarten children. We believe that this research might promote your awareness in second language or foreign language (L2) structures and teaching strategies, e.g., what to teach, when, and what to focus in feedback.

**Will the study involve any risk or discomfort for me? If so, what will be done to rectify it?**

We do not expect that you will have a bad experience in this research. However, if you feel uncomfortable when you do this project and during the recordings, you can ask the researcher to stop at any time.

**How do you intend to publish or disseminate the results?**

It is anticipated that the results of this research project will be published and/or presented in a variety of forums. In any publication and/or presentation, information will be provided in such a way that the participant cannot be identified, except with your permission.

**Will the data and information that I have provided be disposed of?**

Only the researcher (Isriani Hardini) and her supervisory panel (A/Prof. Satomi Kawaguchi, Prof. Carol Reid and A/Prof. Bruno Di Biase) will have authority to use or access your child in this project. However, the data may be used in other related projects such as Post-Doctoral research in the next 5 years.
Can I withdraw from the study?
Your participation in the study is entirely voluntary. You can choose if you want to participate or not. You may withdraw from the study at any time and you do not need to tell us why. If you withdraw, all records of your participation will be destroyed and further data will not be collected. However, the data that have been gained up until that point will not be destroyed and the data will be used for the researcher in the thesis.

Can I tell other people about the study?[Remove if not relevant]
Yes, you can tell other people about the study by contacting Isriani Hardini as the Chief investigator to discuss their participation in the research project and obtain a copy of the information sheet.

What if I require further information?
Please contact Isriani Hardini should you wish to discuss the research further before deciding whether or not to participate.

- Isriani Hardini, PhD candidate, +61 414 340 819, email: 18490031@student.westernsydney.edu.au
- A/Prof Satomi Kawaguchi, Principal Supervisor, (+61) 29772 6567, email: S.Kawaguchi@student.westernsydney.edu.au
- Prof Carol Reid, Co-supervisor, (+61) 29772 6524, email: C.Reid@westernsydney.edu.au
- A/Prof Bruno Di Biase, Co-supervisor, (+61) 29772 6292, email: B.DiBiase@westernsydney.edu.au

What if I have a complaint?
If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through Research Engagement, Development and Innovation (REDI) on Tel +61 2 4736 0229 or email humanethics@westernsydney.edu.au.
Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
If you agree to participate in this study, you may be asked to sign the Participant Consent Form. The information sheet is for you to keep and the consent form is retained by the researcher/s.

This study has been approved by the Western Sydney University Human Research Ethics Committee. The Approval number is [enter approval number once the project has been approved].

8.6 Ethics Approval Number
HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

19 December 2017

Associate Professor Satomi Kawaguchi
School of Humanities and Communication Arts

Dear Satomi,

I wish to formally advise you that the Human Research Ethics Committee has approved your research proposal H12465 “Lexical and Grammatical Development in English as a Foreign Language in Indonesian Kindergarten Children”, until 19 December 2020 with the provision of a progress report annually if over 12 months and a final report on completion.

In providing this approval the HREC determined that the proposal meets the requirements of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research.

This protocol covers the following researchers:
Satomi Kawaguchi, Bruno Di Blase, Carol Reid, Isriani Hardini

Conditions of Approval

1. A progress report will be due annually on the anniversary of the approval date.

2. A final report will be due at the expiration of the approval period.

3. Any amendments to the project must be approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee prior to being implemented. Amendments must be requested using the HREC Amendment Request Form: https://www.westernsydney.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0012/1005665/FORM_Amendment_Request.doc

4. Any serious or unexpected adverse events on participants must be reported to the Human Research Ethics Committee via the Human Ethics Officer as a matter of priority.

5. Any unforeseen events that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project should also be reported to the Committee as a matter of priority

6. Consent forms are to be retained within the archives of the School or Research Institute and made available to the Committee upon request.

7. Project specific conditions:
There are no specific conditions applicable.

Please quote the registration number and title as indicated above in the subject line on all future correspondence related to this project. All correspondence should be sent to the e-mail address humanethics@westernsydney.edu.au as this e-mail address is closely monitored.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted]

Professor Elizabeth Deane

Presiding Member
Western Sydney University Human Research Ethics Committee
# Appendix 9. Lesson plans

## February 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>VOCABULARY ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monday, February 12, 2018</td>
<td>apple-apples, banana-bananas, strawberry-strawberries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 14, 2018</td>
<td>orange-oranges, pineapple-pineapples, mango-mangoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 21, 2018</td>
<td>dog-dogs, horse-horses, cat-cats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friday, February 23, 2018</td>
<td>elephant-elephants, cow-cows, duck-ducks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monday, February 26, 2018</td>
<td>carrot-carrots, tomato-tomatoes, potato-potatoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 28, 2018</td>
<td>pumpkin-pumpkins, rose-roses, bag-bags</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>VOCABULARY ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Friday, March 03, 2018</td>
<td>table-tables, book-books, car-cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Monday, March 05, 2018</td>
<td>bus-buses, train-trains, truck-trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 07, 2018</td>
<td>star-stars, triangle-triangles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Friday, March 09, 2018</td>
<td>heart-hearts, square-squares</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Lexical Plural (Colour+Noun)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>VOCABULARY ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Monday, March 12, 2018</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 14, 2018</td>
<td>red apple-red apples, yellow star-yellow stars, blue heart-blue hearts, orange carrot-orange carrots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 16, 2018</td>
<td>Red strawberry-red strawberries, yellow banana-yellow bananas, black star-black stars, white horse-white horses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, March 19, 2018</td>
<td>Yellow square-yellow squares, brown dog-brown dogs, green mango-green mangoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, March 21, 2018</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phrasal Plural (Number+Noun)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 23, 2018</td>
<td>One star-(two, three, four) stars; one heart-(three, four) hearts; one book-four books; one truck-six trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, March 26, 2018</td>
<td>One square-(two, three, four) squares; one cow-two cows; one mango-two mangoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 28, 2018</td>
<td>One triangle-(two, three) triangles; one table-three tables; one duck-four ducks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### April 2018

### Noun Phrase (Number+Colour+Noun)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, April 02, 2018</td>
<td>Five blue stars, three white horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 04, 2018</td>
<td>Two green mangoes, four brown dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, April 06, 2018</td>
<td>Three yellow squares, three red triangles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, April 09, 2018</td>
<td>Five orange carrots, three black hearts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 11, 2018</td>
<td>Two red apples, four yellow ducks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, April 16, 2018</td>
<td>Three brown tables, two blue bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 18, 2018</td>
<td>A lot of apples, many apples, some carrots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, April 20, 2018</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>