e-Journal of Linguistics
Available online at https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/eol/index
Vol. 19, No. 2, July 2025, pages: 156--174
Print ISSN: 2541-5514 Online ISSN: 2442-7586
https://doi.org/10.24843/e-jl.2025.v19.i02.p13

Cross-Linguistic Influence in Indonesian-Dutch Bilingual Children: a Predictive Model

[1]Mila Irmawati
UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Bandung, Indonesia, milairmawati@uinsgd.ac.id
Cognition, Affect and Wellbeing Laboratory University of Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

[2]Bagus Pragnya Paramarta
Mercu Buana University, Jakarta, Indonesia, bagus.pragnya@mercubuana.ac.id
STIBA Indonesia LPI, Jakarta, Indonesia

Article info

Received Date:5 Maret 2025

Accepted Date: 30 April 2025

Published Date:31 July 2025

Keywords:*
- *Cross-linguistic Influence, Indonesian-Dutch bilinguals, Autonomous Development, Interface Hypothesis, Competition Model*

Abstract*

Bilingualism is a common is common in many countries, retrieved by the existence of two languages within individuals. One notable challenge faced by bilinguals is the difficulty in expressing thought across languages since there will be an influence from one language to another; this phenomenon can be called a cross-linguistic influence (CLI). CLI arises from competition between languages, leading to interference that can manifest in various linguistic domains. Although CLI has been widely discussed in previous research, factors contributing to CLI are still debatable, especially within the field of bilingualism. The present study aims to predict the cross-linguistic interference between two different languages, Indonesian and Dutch. We examined this interference based on three hypotheses: Autonomous Development, Interface Hypothesis, and Competition Model. We use the descriptive qualitative method, we analyze the data extracted from bilinguals to test the validity of these hypotheses in predicting patterns of CLI between two varied language combinations. The result shows that the prediction regarding CLI is significantly determined by the typological distinction between Indonesian and Dutch. The study concludes that various predictions of cross-linguistic interference are related to the typological distinction between Indonesian and Dutch, as it is interpreted from those three frameworks. Finally, this study suggests that further research must evaluate and validate the prediction to gain a more in-depth understanding of theoretical and practical implications.

1. Introduction

The term of 'bilingual' refers to individual, including children and adults, who are fluent to speak in two languages. Bilinguals should have knowledge of two different language systems, forming two different linguistic representations in their brain (Paradis & Genesee, 1996; De Houwer, 1990). Unlike monolinguals, since bilingual individuals tend to have more than one linguistic representation in their brains, the linguistic structures of those two languages may interact. Consequently, bilingual may occasionally produce ungrammatical sentences in the interplay of both languages, where one language's structure influences to another.

The CLI phenomenon in bilingual children raises a critical issue that needs to be investigated, particularly in linguistics, psychology, and education. As globalization spreads among developing countries, the multilingual environment also increases. Therefore, understanding how children navigate multiple languages is crucial. This is relevant to Indonesian-Dutch bilingual children, who received two different exposures to dissimilar language systems, which may lead to complex interaction. The cognitive and linguistic implications of such bilingualism warrant thorough investigation, as they can significantly impact language development and executive functioning skills (Bialystok, 2001; Kroll & Bialystok, 2013).

Various terms have been employed to characterize the ability of bilingual children to transfer the language systems between two languages (Serratrice, 2013). While some terminologies such as, *transfer, interference, cross-linguistic influence,* and *interdependence* have been utilized by many researchers, Paradis and Genesee (1995; 1996), offer different perspectives. They said that cross-linguistic influence (CLI) is the acceleration, facilitation, transfer, or delay in acquiring two languages in bilingual children. This notion highlights the complex interplay between the two distinct languages developing the bilingual minds of individuals.

CLI can not be separated from these concepts: autonomous development, interface hypothesis, and competition model. Autonomous development is the situation in which bilingual children develop their minds independently, suggesting that each language system can operate autonomously (Unsworth, 2013). This perspective emphasizes the potential balance of the development of each language. This means bilingual children will have the same capability when they use two different languages. However, this case does not happen to every bilingual, especially for children who are still learning their second language (Hulk & Müller, 2000).

In contrast, the interface hypothesis often appears when bilinguals combine dissimilar linguistic components, such as syntax and semantics. This hypothesis proposes that bilinguals may struggle when the grammatical systems of their two languages is distinct, which may lead to potential errors (Döpke, 1998). For Indonesian-Dutch bilingual children, this can be seen in the transfer of syntactic structure from one language to another, especially when the language shares similar words but different grammatical rules. For example, the word "bank" in Indonesian is categorized as a noun meaning a financial institution; however, in Dutch, the word "bank" also has a different meaning as a chair. Thus, this condition can confuse Indonesian-Dutch bilinguals when they need to comprehend Indonesian or Dutch.

Moreover, the competition model refers to the interplay between languages in a bilingual's mind. This process involves lexical access and language production within two languages (Swain & Lapkin, 2005). A cognitive conflict arises in this situation, particularly when individuals must choose which language to use. This can influence the patterns and systems of the selected language. For Indonesian-Dutch bilinguals, the competition can influence their vocabulary and usage patterns as they navigate the complexities of their bilingual environment (Thomas & Collier, 2002).

Nevertheless, what condition and what factor that influence CLI is still debatable. Some researcher assume that CLI occur due to the factor within language itself as explored by (Döpke, 1998; Müller, 1998; (Hulk & Müller, 2000; Genske, 2014; (Serratrice et al., 2004). On the other hand, other researchers found that CLI is driven by external factor, like how frequently a language is encountered and which language is used more (Yip & Matthews, 2000 & Matthews, 2006; Soriente, 2014; Kang, 2013). Moreover, other researcher indicate that both internal and external factor contribute to CLI (Kupisch, 2007); (Ge et al., 2017; Sorace & Serratrice, 2009; Nicoladis, 2012; (Herve et al., 2016).

One substantial body of research on CLI in other bilingual contexts, such as Spanish-English and Cantonese-English, can be referred to Nicoladis, (2006), who discusses dynamic transfer and CLI in a bilingual context. Nicoladis discussed dynamic transfer on CLI, which is sometimes seen as a sign of confusion but also reflects the bilingual's ability to effectively utilize both languages to convey meaning. Further studies focus on bilinguals of Romance-Germanic languages; in this case, they have similar typology, i.e., tense language and word order. However, research on bilingualism involving Austronesian languages, such as Indonesian, is less common. For instance, a study from (Soriente, 2014) showed that sometime Indonesian dominance led to CLI in the acquisition process among Indonesian-Italian bilingual children.

Furthermore, Adnyani et al., (2018) employed a case study to examine the progression of verbal morphology and word order in the Indonesian-German bilingual children. Their findings indicate that internal and external factors clearly contribute to CLI in bilingual language development. Another language distinction was also found, particularly in the structure of Germanic and Romance languages, i.e., non-tense vs. tense language, as well as the differentiation of the word order (Van Dijk & Unsworth, 2023), it is interesting to explore the potential CLI that may arise in Austronesian-Germanic and Austronesian-Romance bilinguals. The aim of this study is to deepen our knowledge of Austronesian-Germanic and Austronesia-Romance bilingualism by exploring prediction of CLI in Indonesian-Dutch bilingual children, focusing on typological distinction between two languages. We utilize three different frameworks; the autonomous development, the interface hypothesis, and the competition model. The result of this research may provide a comprehensive insight into the broader implications of bilingualism for cognitive and language development, especially for children.

In the subsequent section, we will review the prior research related to CLI among bilinguals in this study. Following this, a comparative of typological features between two languages will be presented. Building on this analysis, we will present the prediction of CLI in Indonesian-Dutch bilingual children, using diverse theoretical viewpoints. Finally, we will conclude the key findings and implications of this research.

Literature review

1. Cross-linguistic Influence

Cross-linguistic influence (CLI) is the linguistic phenomenon that occurs when one language influences another in its usage or acquisition by an individual speaker (Wrembel, 2015). This phenomenon is particularly relevant to bilingualism or multilingualism when they simultaneously combine their language. CLI has been investigated in various studies that explore its implications across different linguistic contexts and age groups, including children.

Research has shown that CLI can be observed in both adults and children with different language knowledge; the influence of one language system on another often occurs when a person switches from one language to another. This is caused by many factors such as language dominance, age of acquisition, and linguistic structure involved. For instance, in Italian-English bilingual children who overuse the pronoun as a subject, this pattern is influenced by the English pattern (Serratrice et al., 2012). This is in line with Jiang & Chen, (2019), who investigated the narratives of English-Chinese bilinguals to understand how their argument structure from both languages, suggesting that CLI is an important issue in language development.

The mechanisms underlying CLI are complex and multifaceted. One piece of evidence is that there is a structural overlap between language use. For example, when bilingual speakers combine similar structures in both languages, they may unconsciously apply rules from one

language to another, resulting in a language pattern that is different from the native pattern (Sorace & Serratrice, 2009). This overlap can occur in many linguistic levels, including syntax, pragmatics, and morphology. Another study by Argyri & Sorace, (2007) noted that the use of postverbal strong object pronouns in Greek may impact the use of similar structures in English. It indicates how surface-level similarities can have cross-linguistic effects Argyri & Sorace, (2007).

Moreover, the age of acquisition also significantly impacts the complexity of CLI. Studies show that the interlanguage effects on people who learn two languages from childhood tend to be smaller than those on people who learn a second language only after a certain age. For instance, late bilingual English learners have been found to show cross-language transfer patterns that reflect the previous linguistic experience (Hohenstein et al., 2006). This notion suggests that the time when the language is acquired can demonstrate the degree of CLI; earlier bilinguals may have a better shift of the linguistic system.

CLI is not confined to the grammatical structure or language pattern; phonological and morphological aspects are also relevant to this subject. Bilingual speakers may use phonetic features from one language while speaking another language. This is common in children who are still developing their phonological awareness (Foursha-Stevenson et al., 2024). In addition, at the morphological level, lexical borrowing can occur when a bilingual speaks words from one language and then switches to another language. This can be their strategy to fill the lexical gap or effect of their dominant language (Altuğ & Önal, 2022). This active interplay between two languages reflects the speakers' ability in their language usage.

The role of the dominant language in CLI has been debatable among researchers. Some findings suggest that the dominant language can have a stronger influence on the other language, leading to unequal exchange in language use (Kang, 2013). For example, a bilingual who is more fluent in one language may struggle to apply the grammatical system in their weaker language, leading to a transfer structure from the dominant language. This dominant language may be determined by various factors such as language usage, language exposure, and individual ability to process the language.

In addition to structural overlap and language dominance, external factors such as sociolinguistics and exposure to the social environment can also affect CLI. Bilinguals are often conscious of their linguistic environment when many languages exist. This leads to varying degrees of influence based on the specific context in which they use the language. For instance, bilinguals in multilingual environments may increase CLI due to a constant interaction between languages, which can facilitate the transfer of linguistic systems across languages (Sánchez & Brisk, 2004). This environment of CLI highlights the importance of external factors when studying bilinguals, especially in language development.

Furthermore, CLI can have both advantages and disadvantages in language acquisition. On the one hand, it can facilitate the use of existing linguistic knowledge to understand new structures in a second language. On the other side, it may lead to interlanguage, where the utilization of rules from one language results in irregularity from the rules of another language (Meir & Janssen, 2021). This different nature of CLI emphasizes the complexity of bilingual language processing and the need for a comprehensive understanding of how bilinguals navigate their linguistic environment.

To explore this complexity further, three theoretical frameworks can explain the mechanism of CLI in bilingual children. They are Autonomous Development Hypothesis, Interface Hypothesis, and Competition Model. This section describes those three theories based on various empirical data from previous studies on cross-linguistic influence, beginning by

explaining the Autonomous Development Hypothesis, followed by the Interface Hypothesis and Competition Model.

1.1 **Autonomous Development Hypothesis**

Autonomous Development is a key idea in studying how bilingual children, like those who speak Indonesian and Dutch, learn and use their two languages. This concept explains how bilingual children develop two distinct language systems. While there may be some interaction between the languages, each language grows in its way. The Autonomous Development Hypothesis states that their no interaction between to grammatical systems in bilingual children (Paradis & Genesee, 1996).

Numerous studies have provided evidence to support the Autonomous Development Hypothesis that bilingual children can differentiate between their language and another language from the earliest stage of language acquisition. For instance, Genesee et al. conducted research on French-English bilingual children, revealing that these children could distinguish between their two languages even when they appeared in code-mixing. Their findings indicate that how often children mix their language is determined by which language they use the most and other external influences, not parental input. This reinforces the concept that bilingual children develop separate language systems (Kai, 2016). Similarly, another study by Paradis and Genesee's investigation proves that functional categories in bilingual children found no evidence of transfer or delay in the acquisition of grammatical structure compared to their monolingual peers. This will lead to the notion that bilingual children acquire their grammar independently (Ge et al., 2023).

Despite bilingual children developing their languages autonomously, it is important to take note of the times their language influences each other. This interplay leads to unique development, especially in the early stages of language acquisition. Other findings from Ritonga et al., (2018) suggest that bilingual exposure can increase first-language development, even in children with developmental challenges such as Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). This underscores that bilingual children can still maintain and develop their language skills across languages, even when they struggle with additional cognitive demands. In addition, Morales et al., in Álvarez, (2003), have documented the cognitive benefits of bilingual children, especially improved executive function, which results in better performance in cognitive flexibility tasks. This cognitive flexibility supports the autonomous development of language in bilingual contexts.

Their exposure to both languages significantly shapes the language development of Indonesia-Dutch bilingual children, this situation makes the Autonomous Development theory particularly applicable to their situation. Blom, (2010) demonstrates that bilingual environments do not automatically lead to language development disorder. Instead, both bilingual and monolingual children are influenced by the situation of shared contributing factors. This means that a bilingual environment can create a stimulating language setting that helps each language to develop in its own way. The study by Schott et al., (2021) highlights that bilinguals sometimes struggle when they want to select the grammatical and lexical structures of both languages, leading to the production of cross-linguistic structures. This combining of language is more common in children who do not fully understand the concept of both languages, as they tend to rely on the knowledge from one language and use it in another language.

The balance between autonomy and interdependence in bilingual language development is further illustrated by research examining the grammatical development of bilingual children in

various social environments (Tare & Gelman, 2011). The findings suggest that the social context play a significant role in shaping the linguistic environment, influencing how children navigate their bilingualism. This underscores the necessity of social context and linguistic environment, which can either support or prevent the autonomous development of each language.

In conclusion, the concept of Autonomous Development provides a valuable framework for understanding the language acquisition processes of Indonesian-Dutch bilingual children. It underscores the independent yet interconnected nature of bilingual language development, where each language can flourish in its own right while still being influenced by the other. This understanding is crucial for educators and practitioners working with bilingual children, as it emphasizes the need to support both languages in a manner that acknowledges their unique developmental trajectories.

However, another perspective indicates that transfer between two languages in bilinguals exists. To examine this concept, the Interface hypothesis, and the competition model will be discussed in the following section. According to Bedore and Peña in Morales et al., (2013) measuring the use of modal verbs in bilingual children can help to determine their linguistic development. This highlights that while bilingual children can perform strong proficiency in both languages, they may occasionally experience overlap or confusion.

1.2 **Interface Hypothesis**

As mentioned in the introduction section above, instead of due to external language factors, i.e., language dominance, quality of input, and age, CLI might occur due to language-internal factors. This notion is well proven by the study of Hulk & Müller, (2000), who introduced the Interface Hypothesis (IH) idea. Hulk & Müller, (2000) argued that CLI happens spontaneously due to ambiguity and structural overlap, rather then language dominance or native language input.

Hulk & Müller, (2000) see bilinguals' progress in developing sentences. They expected to see one language influence the other, when they have similar typology. Conversely, they predict there would be no transfer when both languages do not have the same typology. Their result strengthens this, showing influence in only one direction.

Genske, (2014), confirms the Interface Hypothesis. Their study reveals participants transferred from German Grammar to English by moving finite verbs over negation, resulting non-English utterance. The result supports the Interface Hypothesis in which there is an overlap in the surface word order in main declarative clauses between German and English. Furthermore, a study of English-Italian bilinguals by Serratrice et al., (2004) validate the Interface Hypothesis. They predict that syntax and pragmatics play significant role in CLI.

While the interface hypothesis explains that language influence flows in one direction. Ge et al., (2017) found evidence a bidirectional transfer among Cantonese-English bilinguals in how words are arrange in sentence, demonstrating inconsistency with theoretical expectation. This contradicts the Interface Hypothesis claims that the cross-linguistic transfer must be unidirectional. Study how English right dislocation pronoun affected Cantonese, they found English influence on learning Cantonese right dislocation pronoun, indicating that structural overlap alone does not explain the two way language transfer.

In addition, Nicoladis, (2012) said that bidirectional cross-linguistic influence in French-English bilingual children have been found in the terms of possessives. This evidence challenge the Interfac e Hypothesis' unidirectional view and supports a speech production perspective. The essential competition between two activated languages in bilinguals make xical or syntactic influence. This aligns with (Herve et al., 2016), who investigate the role of language processing or speech production models in French-English bilingual children.

Furthermore Tribushinina et al., (2017) conducted Dutch-Russian bilinguals, Dutch and Russian monolinguals, and Russian children with Specific Language Impairment (SLI). They examined the use of discourse connectives in the participants' narratives. It was interesting since the typology of additive connectives in Dutch and Russian shows a difference. They found no differences between monolinguals and bilinguals in discourse connectives, although discourse connectives have more distributional restrictions in Russian compared to Dutch. Consequently, the finding challenges the Interface Hypothesis which predict that CLI come from language with limited use of target structure to a language with more frequently use. Instead, external language factors, such as dominance, likely play significant role. The competition model will be explained in the next section.

1.3 **Competition Model**

The third theoretical framework is the Competition Model which proposed by (Bates & MacWhinney, 1989). The Competition Model predicts competition within the human cognitive system to select which language system to use for expression. MacWhinney, (1997) further argue that language transfer occurs when similar features in the two language lead to the competition. In this situation bilingual children rely on their dominant language**.**

The Competition Model differs from the Internal Hypothesis by allowing transfer at all levels of language processing. However, previous research on Competition Model has typically centered on role assignment in simple transitive sentences. Beyond simple transitive sentences, the Competition Model also applies to other area. For example, it demonstrates how prepositional phrase attach to verb or noun, as in *the woman discussed the dogs on the beach*. The model also explains how word order and case marking are used.

Moreover, the exploration of competition model derived from Döpke's (1998) which examine German-English bilingual children when learning word order. He revealed that bilingual often make mistake in their utterance due to the distinct language system. German utilize both Verb-Object (VO) and Object-Verb (OV), when English consistent to use Verb-Object (VO). This findings indicate that similar word order pattern (VO) creates competition for bilingual learners. They prefer to use VO when they speak rather than OV due to shared familiarity in both languages. Therefore, the Competition Model is more appropriate to this finding rather than the Interface Hypothesis.

Furthermore Müller, (1998) argued that children often use English word order in German subordinate clause. This transfer is observable because the consistent VO order in English competes with VO and OV patter that utilize in German. Due to this consistency, English-German bilingual prefer to use the English word order pattern.

In the following section, we will explain the typological differences between Indonesian and Dutch and the possible prediction of cross-linguistic interference based on the Interface Hypothesis and the Competition Model.

2. **Typological differences between Indonesian and Dutch**

2.1 **Word order**

The typological differences between the Indonesian and Dutch languages are important, particularly in their syntactic structures, especially concerning word order.

According to (Soriente, 2007), Indonesian structure is classified as a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) language, which shares similar characteristics to English. The SVO structure is

flexible, meaning that it always applies in the main clause and also in the subordinate clauses. For instance, the sentences below:

Aku makan apel. "I eat an apple."
Dia berkata bahwa aku makan apel. "She says that I eat an apple."

Conversely, Dutch also employs an SVO pattern in the main clause but displays a different syntactic behavior in the subordinate clause, where it often shifts to a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV), (Koster, 1975). The following example demonstrates the change of the pattern.

SVO: *Marie aait de hond* 'Mary pets the dog'
SOV: *Peter zegt dat Marie de hond aait* 'Peter says that Marie the dog pets'

This distinction underscores a fundamental typological difference between the two languages. Dutch changes its word order in subordinate clauses, while Indonesian keeps its SVO consistent.

2.2 **Verb morphology**

The typological distinction between Indonesian and Dutch, especially regarding verb morphology, reveals a significant contrast in their linguistic structure. (Loewen, 2011) argued that SI (Standard Indonesian) is an agglutinative language with SVO order. This means that affixes are attached to root words to create new words with related meanings, an essential part of how the words are formed. In addition, (Soriente, 2007) said that in the domain of morphological systems, SI does not have inflections. For instance, take the adjective *sedih,* which means sad, adding the prefix *ber*, giving us the intransitive verb *bersedih,* telling us to be upset or sad, whereas when we add the sircumfix *ke-an*, giving us *kesedihan*, meaning sadness as a noun form.

However, Dutch operates an inflectional morphological system. This means that Dutch verbs change their form to express grammatical relationships, such as tense, mood, and subject agreements (Lemmens & Perrez, 2018). Additionally, verbs like 'hebben' (to have) demonstrate stem changes, becoming 'heeft' in the third person singular. The following table illustrates these changes for a more concise explanation.

Table 1
(Verb changes in Dutch)

	Lexical verbs		**Modals**		**Auxiliries**	
	Hear		**May**		**Have**	
1st sg	*Hoor*	-0	*Mag*	-0	*Heb*	-0
2nd sg	*Hoort*	-t	*Mag*	-0	*Hebt*	-t
3rd sg	*Hoort*	-t	*Mag*	-0	*Heeft*	-eft
1st pl	*Horen*	-en	*Mogen*	-en	*Hebben*	-en
2nd pl	*Horen*	-en	*Mogen*	-en	*Hebben*	-en
3rd pl	*Horen*	-en	*Mogen*	-en	*Hebben*	-en

This inflection demonstrates a complex system in which grammatical context can change substantially due to additional affixes. Moreover, language structure differences, especially

regarding morphological verbs, influence not only grammar but also how speakers conceptualize and express actions and states. For instance, the absence of Inflection in Indonesian allows a straightforward expression, as context becomes the key to conveying the meaning. Conversely, the inflectional nature of Dutch with a more complex structure can enable a subtle way to express time and aspect (Soriente, 2013; Lemmens & Perrez, 2018). This distinction is particularly relevant in bilingual contexts, where individuals may navigate between the two systems, leading to interesting patterns of language use and acquisition (Adnyani et al., 2018; Tribushinina et al., 2021).

Morphological verb distinction also reflects the cultural background and cognitive framework of each language. Indonesians use agglutination and context to communicate, and this linguistic style reflects their collectivist culture, where understanding context is very important (Dewi et al., 2015). In contrast, the Dutch inflectional system may reflect individualism, emphasizing precision and clarity in communication (Dewi et al., 2015). These cultural highlights can influence not only language use but also how speakers of each language perceive and interact with the world around them.

In summary, the typological distinction between Indonesian and Dutch in terms of verb morphology demonstrates the fundamental contrast in their linguistic structure and cognitive frameworks. The Indonesian language, with an agglutinative nature, enables flexible and context-dependent expression of meaning. On the other hand, the Dutch inflectional system requires more precise grammar from the user. These differences not only shape both languages but also affect the cultural and cognitive processes of their speaker, emphasizing the intricate relationship between language, thought, and society.

2.3 **Noun-adjective construction**

The typological distinction between Indonesian and Dutch, particularly in noun-adjective construction, demonstrates the syntactic differences that reflect broader linguistic structure.

In Standard Indonesian (SI), the adjective is always preceded by the head noun (N-A string). For instance, the phrase *kucing putih besar,* translates to "the big white cat" where *kucing* (cat) is followed by the adjective *putih* (white) and *besar* (big) (Soriente, 2007). The following illustration is the detailed explanation:

Kucing	*Putih*	*Besar*		The big	White	Cat
N	Adj	Adj		Adj	Adj	N

This initial positioning of nouns is the characteristic of the Indonesian structure, which makes the Indonesian language different from other languages, where word order determines the important role of conveying grammatical relationships.

However, in Dutch, employ a pre-nominal adjective-noun (A-N strings). In Dutch, adjective position occurs before a noun and is very common in many Germanic languages. This is the following explanation:

(4a) *groot huis* 'big house.'
(4b) *rode auto* 'red car.'

This positioning of an adjective is not only a matter of stylistic choice but is deeply connected to the grammatical rule of each language. Dutch, which is considered a fusional

language, often requires agreement between nouns and adjectives in terms of gender and number, which affect the word order and the syntactic structure of noun phrases (Schiller & Caramazza, 2003) The Dutch language, which changes the form of words following nouns, gender, and number, demands the Dutch language learner to understand and be able to implement this rule. This situation requires the learner to learn the rule, especially for learners whose language does not use this rule.

2.4 **Definiteness**

In Standard Indonesian (SI), definiteness is indicated through the use of of demonstrative pronouns marker. As outlined by Almatsier, (1988), *itu* 'that' and *ini* 'this' is considered as a demonstrative pronoun. In addition, *itu* and *ini* also serve as an article that refers back to entity that have been mentioned before. Crucially, the demonstrative *itu* and *ini* are positioned after the N (noun) or NP (noun phrase). They modify and serve as context specific determiners, whether it is interpreted as 'that' or 'the'. The following example is the illustration for this concept.

(5) *Harga tas **itu** dua kali (lipat) dari harga aslinya.*
Price bag D two times from price original.DEF
a. '**That** bag's price is twice as much as the original price.'
b. '**The** bag's price is twice as much as the original price.'

In addition, *ini* is employed to denote noun that is near to the speaker, while *itu* is used for noun that is far from the speaker. Significantly, there is no difference between singular and plural form when using this demonstrative marker. Both of then can accompanied by singular and plural. However, in SI noun pluralization can be indicated through reduplication, involving the duplication of noun followed by an appropriate demonstrative marker. This following example gives the clear illustration.

Table 2
(Examples of the use of *ini* and *itu*)

Pronoun	Indonesian	English
ini	*Lagu ini*	This song, these songs, the song(s)
	Lagu-lagu ini	These songs, (all) the songs
itu	*Anjing itu*	That dog, those dogs, the dog(s)
	Anjing-anjing itu	Those dogs, the (various) dogs

Another way to express definiteness in SI is by using the enclitic *-nya* (Perangin-angin, 2004). The enclitic *-nya* behaves like the English definite article 'the', which establishes the N as definite. Consider the example below.

(6) *Ari menyirami taman dengan air. Sekarang air ***(-nya)** menggenangi taman itu.*
Ari MEN-pour garden with water now water.DEF MEN-whelm garden DEF
'Ari poured water on the garden. Now the water floods the garden.'
(Perangin-angin 2004:3)

Moreover, Definiteness in standard Indonesian is expressed through demonstrative pronouns and enclitics, which are often used interchangeable. Their application also flexible, it depends on the speaker preference or context.

Conversely in Dutch, according to Roelandt, (2014), there are two definite determiners: *de* and *het*. This fundamental aspect of Dutch contrast with the system observed in SI, where definiteness does not incorporate with gender. The Dutch language utilize the gender systems: feminine, masculine, and neuter. The choice between the determiners “de” and “het” influenced by the gender of noun, and also its number. The following table is the illustration.

Table 3
(The distribution of the definite determiners in Dutch)

	feminine	**masculine**	**neuter**
singular	de	de	het
mass	de	de	het
plural	de	de	de

2.5 **Possessive constructions**

The typological distinction between the Indonesian and Dutch languages, particularly regarding their possessive construction, displays a significant syntactic structure contrast.

In SI, the possessive construction follows a possessed-prossessor order, which is different from the possessor-possessed order as seen in Dutch and English. For instance, in SI, the phrase "hidung mama" translates to "mother's nose," where "hidung" (nose) is the possessed noun and "mama" (mother) is the possessor, demonstrating the Indonesian syntactic structure (Salamun, 2019). Similarly, *rumah Mila* translates to “Mila’s house”, also utilizes possessed-processor order (Salamun, 2019). This syntactic structure displays the typological characteristic of Indonesia, where possessive construction often prioritizes the possessed noun, reflecting a unique linguistic framework. The following example is a detailed illustration.

(7a) *hidung mama*
nose mama
‘mother’s nose’

(7b) *rumah Mila*
house Mila
‘Mila’s house’

Conversely, unlike in Standard Indonesian (SI), Dutch noun possessive constructions behave like English in that the possessor is followed by the possessed. For example, “Mila’s huis” translates to “Mila’s house’ and “Moeders neus” means “Mother’s nose”, both illustrating the possessor–possessed order (Baroroh & Mulyadi, 2020). The following is a detailed illustration.

(8a) *Mila’s huis* ‘Mila’s house.’
(8b) *Moeders neus* ‘Mother’s nose.’

This alignment with English syntax demonstrates that Dutch operates a different grammatical paradigm, which may affect the cognitive processing of possessive relationships in speakers of these languages. The implication of syntactic difference is not only in word order but extends to how speakers conceptualize how to use possession and ownership correctly in every language rule.

2.6 **Plural marking**

The typological difference between Indonesian and Dutch in terms of plural making reveals fundamental differences in their morphological structure. In standard Indonesian, plurality is deployed through the process of reduplication, where either the entire constituent or a part of it is repeated. For instance, *buku* (a/the book) becomes *buku-buku* (the books); *tarian* (a/the dance) becomes *tari-tarian* (the dances) (Puspani & Indrawati, 2021; Dalrymple & Mofu, 2012). This morphological rule not only marks the plurality but also reflects the character of the Indonesian language, particularly in the utilization of reduplication. The use of reduplication is a distinctive feature of Indonesian morphology, which makes it different from many other languages, including Dutch.

On the other hand, the Dutch implement a different way to indicate plurality. The Dutch language typically marks plural nouns by adding a specific suffix to the base noun, such as "-en" or "-s.". For example, the singular noun “boek” (book) becomes “booken” (books) in the plural form. This morphological addition is the characteristic of the fusion language or inflectional language, where plurality is often expressed through affixes rather than reduplication.

2. Research Methods

The present study employed descriptive qualitative methods to analyze the predictions. The literature review was employed to gain data and draw the conclusion of the CLI predicting Indonesian-Dutch children. The data of the present study included several typology differences between Indonesian and Dutch, including word order, verb morphology, noun-adjective construction, definiteness, possessive construction, and plural marking. Those data were gained from a literature review of several previous studies (e.g., Soriente, 2007; Koster, 1975; Loewen, 2011; Lemmens & Perrez, 2018; Perangin-angin, 2004; Roelandt, 2014; Salamun, 2019; Baroroh & Mulyadi, 2020; Puspani & Indrawati, 2021; Dalrymple & Mofu, 2012).

To answer the objectives of the present study, the CLI pattern examination and prediction of each typological difference between Indonesian and Dutch had been predicted by the three hypotheses: Autonomous development (Paradis & Genesee, 1996), Interface Hypothesis Hulk & Müller, (2000), and Competition Models (Bates & MacWhinney, 1989). Each of the hypotheses predicts the direction of the transfer and the pattern based on the empirical evidence of the typological differences that exist between Indonesian and Dutch (e.g., word order, verb morphology, noun-adjective construction, definiteness, possessive construction, and plural marking). The prediction was based on the linguistic cues in terms of syntactic structure discrimination between those two languages and how the three hypotheses apply to that typological difference condition to predict the cross-linguistic transfer in Indonesian-Dutch bilingual children.

Finally, the prediction leads to the conclusion of how Indonesian-Dutch bilingual children (locutor) might perform syntactic cognitive transfer when they process one of the languages for their daily communication that leads to a mixing language and affects the processing and comprehension of others (interlocutor).

3. Discussions

Cross-linguistic investigation in Indonesian-Dutch bilingual children requires some findings that construct a theoretical framework grounded in existing literature that can contribute to practical implications and future research. The focus of this analysis is the contrasting syntactic systems, including word order, verb morphology, noun-adjective construction, definiteness, possessive construction, and plural marking in Standard Indonesian (SI) and Dutch. We predict this CLI phenomenon through three theoretical frameworks: the autonomous development, the interface hypothesis, and the competition model.

The typological distinction will affect how Indonesian-Dutch children learn and process their language, beyond just sentence structure. The Autonomous Development Hypothesis suggests that bilingual children develop their two languages independently, which means the syntactic structure of each language can impact the acquisition process (Vásquez Carranza, 2007). For example, an Indonesian-Dutch bilingual child may apply the consistent SVO structure of Indonesian when learning Dutch; after they become more proficient, they may learn to use the SOV structure in subordinate clauses, demonstrating the interplay between the two linguistic systems.

Moreover, the absence of a copula in Indonesian further differentiates it from Dutch. Indonesia, a noun or adjective, can link directly to another noun or pronoun without a copula, which is a grammatical element that connects the subject to another grammatical role. This feature makes sentence construction in Indonesian more straightforward, whereas Dutch requires a copula in certain contexts, adding another layer of complexity to its syntactic structure (Meisel, 1989). For example, in Indonesian, one might say "Dia dokter" (She is a doctor) without a linking verb, while in Dutch, the equivalent would be "Zij is een dokter," where "is" serves as the copula (Wei, 2007).

However, the utilization of the copula in the Dutch language to connect the subject and the predicate reflects a more rigid structure. This necessity for a linking verb in Dutch can be attributed to its grammatical rule, particularly regarding verb placement and agreement, which do not exist in Indonesian (Craats & Hout, 2010; Julien et al., 2015). The difference in how the language deploys the copular construction highlights the broader implication of language transfer in second language acquisition, when learners may experience difficulties with the grammatical rules due to this situation.

Furthermore, due to the flexibility of Indonesian's SVO structure, the Indonesian language is hard to translate into Dutch, which has a more rigid structure. Indonesian speakers can change word order without changing the sentence's core meaning. This flexibility does not exist in Dutch due to its stricter grammar (Genesee et al., 1995). This flexibility gives Indonesian speakers more ways to express themselves, but it poses a challenge for Dutch speakers.

In conclusion, the typological distinction between Indonesian and Dutch, especially regarding word order, leads to the implication for bilingual language acquisition. The consistent SVO pattern of the Indonesian language contrasts with the SVO/SOV alternation in Dutch, affecting how bilingual children learn and use both languages. Understanding this knowledge is crucial for educators and practitioners working with a bilingual population, as it can inform teaching strategies and support mechanisms that accommodate the unique challenges experienced by bilingual learners.

The Competition Model, firstly introduced by MacWhinney, (1989), anticipates that the dominant language dictates syntactic production in bilingual children. Specifically, pretend that

SI is the dominant language, we can predict an SVO (Subject-Verb-Object) order in a Dutch subordinate clause. Conversely, if Dutch is a dominant language, an SOV (Subject-Object-Verb) structure can be found within Indonesian subordinate clauses. Previous studies by Döpke, (1998) (1998) indicate that there is a potential structural transfer from the dominant language to their second language. Therefore, any emerging SVO structure in Indonesian-Dutch children speaking Dutch can explain the wider effect in multilingual contexts (Serratrice et al., 2004).

Bilingual learners often struggle with the part of language that connects the language rule to practical use. This interface hypothesis suggests that a specific part of language learning is significantly influenced by the learner's first language, as well as the rules of the target language. This situation aligns with Chen et al. (2023), who found that bilinguals face a distinct challenge in mastering language interplay. In addition, (Ge et al., 2017) showed in their studies that children with a strong influence of SI probably can make an error in arranging word order. Interestingly, research on how sentence structure influences each other between two languages (bidirectional) can share the new insight to this hypothesis. The result shows that if individuals are capable of using both languages equally well, the two languages can influence each other. So, it is not just one language that influences another but both languages take and give influence to another (Hacohen & Schaeffer, 2007).

Furthermore, morphosyntactic distinction between Indonesian and Dutch merely exists in the verb morphology. From the Interface hypothesis perspective, a demonstrable lack of similarities between two languages, especially in the verb morphology, will affect the Indonesian language, does not influence children when learning Dutch, and vice versa. Although the competition model suggests that it is possible for Dutch dominant children using the Indonesian verb base (without affixation), reflecting simplification of the morphological system, indicating a weaker grammatical processing in the bilingual situation (Montrul, 2002). This aligns with (Paradis, 2010) who shows that when bilinguals struggle to acquire the complex morphological form, they can rely on the structure of their dominant language.

When evaluating the application of definite marker, the same thing happens. Once again, we refer to the interface hypothesis, which predicts limited transfer based on lack of similarities between two languages, particularly in the domain of definiteness. The possibility that Indonesian-Dutch speakers use the Dutch definite feature when speaking Indonesian, as suggested by the competition models, allows us to reevaluate how context and language dominance interact to affect the use of linguistic structure (Hacohen & Schaeffer, 2007). An investigation into the effect of adjectival position, specifically the N-A (Noun-Adjective) order as in Indonesian opposed to Dutch. This different order highlights the importance of how bilingual children manage the syntactic difference of two languages (Montrul, 2004).

The investigation of possessive construction similarly leads to theoretical prediction regarding the transfer phenomenon. Here, due to a lack of structural similarities in processor-possessed construction, from the interface hypothesis perspective, we predict that significant transfer is expectedly absent. However, the different language system in Indonesian-Dutch may offer insight into realities of their bilingual interaction at the higher language level, for example in the syntactic level (Hacohen & Schaeffer, 2007).

Regarding plural marking, the structural divergence between Indonesian and Dutch provides a valuable context for examining morphological transfer dynamics. The distinct pluralization strategies, employing reduplication in Indonesian versus suffixes such as '-en' or '-s' in Dutch, lead the Interface Hypothesis to predict minimal cross-linguistic influence. Otherwise, the competition model forecasts a notable omission of reduplication in Indonesian, while Dutch is a dominant language. This phenomenon suggests an integrative linguistic pressure from Dutch,

potentially weakening the reduplication system of Indonesian morphology (Guijarro-Fuentes & Schmitz, 2015).

Moreover, lexical and grammatical distinction in both languages facilitates a more comprehensive understanding of bilingual experience when shaping their cognitive. Cenoz, (2003) suggests that bilinguals may have a cognitive advantage over monolinguals, particularly in phonological processing and metalinguistic awareness (Cenoz, 2003). Children who face a two-language system may experience unique lexical gaps, demonstrate transfer, minimize error from the dominant language structure, and show complex interlingual interaction (Nicoladis, 2016).

4. Novelties

This study fills the gap in cross-language interference research, particularly in the prediction of language transfer from two different languages. Since there is no prior research on cross-linguistic influence in Indonesian-Dutch bilingual children, the current study sheds light on and becomes the first study that enrich the current prediction and understanding of those language pair by comparing the three theories: Autonomous Development (Paradis & Genesee, 1996), Interface Hypothesis (Hulk & Müller, 2000), and Competition Model (MacWhinney, 1997). By predicting the Indonesian-Dutch cross-linguistic transfer, this study contribute to the theoretical framework since previous studies mainly targeting Germanic-Romance language pairs or Sinitic-Germanic for their cross-language studies.

Unlike many previous studies that focus on quantitative approach, this research utilize qualitative prediction of CLI pattern based on typological distinction. The study extend beyond dedscribing interference; it predicts how and why CLI manfest in Indonesian-Dutch bilingual. This offering new insigh into how language structure influence language development.

From the Indonesian-Dutch bilingual data, this contributes to the broader understanding of bilingualism in nonWestern, and non-European language pair, and renew existing theories that have been exist in European language context.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, Indonesian and Dutch have many distinctions and grammatical constructions. The Autonomous Development Hypothesis suggests that bilingual children develop their language independently, resulting in context-specific application of syntactic patterns. However, the bidirectional influence of SVO structure is inevitable: Indonesian bilinguals learning Dutch are affected by Indonesian SVO, and Dutch learners of Indonesian are similarly affected. This independent development can also lead to different grammatical processing, especially where Indonesian speakers navigate the absence of a copula, which is commonly used in Dutch, resulting in a more complex sentence construction in the future.

The implication of these syntactic distinctions continues to the process of how bilinguals acquire both languages. The Interface Hypothesis suggests that inter-language transfer will be limited by typological differences, including verb morphology and definite markers. This situation poses a unique challenge for children in mastering each language. For instance, in plural marking and possessive construction, bilingual children have to manage different morphological and structural strategies, which probably leads to simplifying features from their dominant language.

The implication of this research contributes to bilingual education and child language development theory, while cross-linguistic influence suggests potential refinement to bilingual

education practice about dynamic interaction of both languages, in the terms of acquisition. Such pedagogical adjustment can foster bilingual to learn their second language.

We suggest longitudinal studies that track cross-linguistic influence over time, the impact of various sociolinguistic context on language dominance and transfer. Thus, comprehensive analysis elaborate both empirical an theoretical can be valuable to explain the complication. Moreover, it provides a foundational understanding for educators and practitioners to develop teaching strategies in multilingual environments (Treffers-Daller & Silva-Corvalán, 2016).

References

Adnyani, N. L. P. S., Beratha, N. L. S., Pastika, I. W., & Suparwa, I. N. (2018a). The Development of Verbal Morphology and Word Order in an Indonesian-German Bilingual Child: A Case Study. *Topics in Linguistics*, *19*(1), 33–53. https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2018-0003

Adnyani, N. L. P. S., Beratha, N. L. S., Pastika, I. W., & Suparwa, I. N. (2018b). The development of verbal morphology and word order in an Indonesian-German bilingual child: A case study. *Topics in Linguistics*, *19*(1), 33–53.

Almatsier, A. M. (1988). *How to Master the Indonesian Language.* Djambatan.

Altuğ, S. A., & Önal, A. (2022). Cross Linguistic Influence: The Case of Adjective and Preposition Collocations. *Journal of Language Education and Research*, *8*(1), 47–69.

Álvarez, E. (2003). Character Introduction in Two Languages: Its Development in the Stories of a Spanish-English Bilingual Child Age 6;11–10;11. *Bilingualism Language and Cognition*, *6*(3), 227–243. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1366728903001159

Argyri, E., & Sorace, A. (2007). Crosslinguistic influence and language dominance in older bilingual children. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *10*(1), 79–99.

Baroroh, K., & Mulyadi, M. (2020). Possessive Expressions in Javanese. *International Journal of Culture and Art Studies*, *4*(1), 42–53. https://doi.org/10.32734/ijcas.v4i1.3848

Bates, E., & MacWhinney, B. (1989). Functionalism and the competition model. *The Crosslinguistic Study of Sentence Processing*, *3*, 73–112.

Blom, E. (2010). Effects of Input on the Early Grammatical Development of Bilingual Children. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *14*(4), 422–446. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006910370917

Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *7*(1), 71–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069030070010501

Craats, I. v. d., & Hout, R. v. (2010). Dummy Auxiliaries in the Second Language Acquisition of Moroccan Learners of Dutch: Form and Function. *Second Language Research*, *26*(4), 473–500. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658310373328

Dalrymple, M., & Mofu, S. (2012). Plural Semantics, Reduplication, and Numeral Modification in Indonesian. *Journal of Semantics*, *29*(2), 229–260. https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffr015

De Houwer, A. (1990). *The acquisition of two languages from birth: A case study*. Cambridge University Press.

Dewi, Z. L., Halim, M. S., & Derksen, J. (2015). The EQ-i Profile of the Indonesians Compared to the Dutch: A Cross-Cultural Approach. *Psychology*, *06*(13), 1700–1710. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2015.613166

Döpke, S. (1998). Competing language structures: The acquisition of verb placement by bilingual German-English children. *Journal of Child Language*, *25*(3), 555–584.

Foursha-Stevenson, C., Nicoladis, E., Trombley, R., Hablado, K., Phung, D., & Dallaire, K. (2024). Pronoun comprehension and cross-linguistic influence in monolingual and bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *28*(3), 479–493.

Ge, H., Lee, A., Yuen, H. K., Liu, F., & Yip, V. (2023). Bilingual Exposure Might Enhance L1 Development in Cantonese–English Bilingual Autistic Children: Evidence From the Production of Focus. *Autism*, *28*(7), 1795–1808. https://doi.org/10.1177/13623613231207449

Ge, H., Matthews, S., Cheung, L. Y., & Yip, V. (2017). Bidirectional cross-linguistic influence in Cantonese–English bilingual children: The case of right-dislocation. *First Language*, *37*(3), 231–251.

Genesee, F., Nicoladis, E., & Paradis, J. (1995). Language differentiation in early bilingual development. *Journal of Child Language*, *22*(3), 611–631.

Genske, K. (2014). *Early Child Bilingualism Cross-Linguistic Influence in the Simultaneous Acquisition of German and English*.

Guijarro-Fuentes, P., & Schmitz, K. (2015). The nature and nurture of heritage language acquisition. *Lingua*, *164*, 239–250. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2015.05.008

Hacohen, A., & Schaeffer, J. (2007). Subject realization in early Hebrew/English bilingual acquisition: The role of crosslinguistic influence. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *10*(3), 333–344. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/S1366728907003100

Herve, C., Serratrice, L., & Corley, M. (2016). Dislocations in French–English bilingual children: An elicitation study. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *19*(5), 987–1000.

Hohenstein, J., Eisenberg, A., & Naigles, L. (2006). Is he floating across or crossing afloat? Cross-influence of L1 and L2 in Spanish–English bilingual adults. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *9*(3), 249–261.

Hulk, A., & Müller, N. (2000). Bilingual first language acquisition at the interface between syntax and pragmatics. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *3*(3), 227–244.

Jiang, X., & Chen, L. (2019). Preferred argument structure in the narratives of Chinese-English bilinguals and their monolingual peers. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *23*(5), 873–887.

Julien, M., Hout, R. v., & Craats, I. v. d. (2015). Meaning and Function of Dummy Auxiliaries in Adult Acquisition of Dutch as an Additional Language. *Second Language Research*, *32*(1), 49–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658315595677

Kai, M. (2016). The Development of Japanese Modality and the Influence of Bilingual Acquisition. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, *4*(6), 412–421. https://doi.org/10.13189/lls.2016.040604

Kang, S.-G. (2013). The role of language dominance in cross-linguistic syntactic influence: A Korean child's use of null subjects in attriting English. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *16*(1), 219–230.

Koster, J. (1975). Dutch as an SOV language. *Linguistic Analysis*, *1*(2), 111–136.

Kupisch, T. (2007). Determiners in bilingual German–Italian children: What they tell us about the relation between language influence and language dominance. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *10*(1), 57–78.

Lemmens, M., & Perrez, J. (2018). *French Onions and Dutch Trains: Typological Perspectives on Learners' Descriptions of Spatial Scenes*. 121–150. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110572186-005

Loewen, G. (2011). *The syntactic structure of noun phrases in Indonesian*. University of Manitoba .

MacWhinney, B. (1989). Competition and lexical categorization. *Linguistic Categorization*, *61*, 195–241.

MacWhinney, B. (1997). Implicit and explicit processes: Commentary. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*(2), 277–281.

Meir, N., & Janssen, B. (2021). Child heritage language development: An interplay between cross-linguistic influence and language-external factors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 651730.

Montrul, S. (2002). Incomplete acquisition and attrition of Spanish tense/aspect distinctions in adult bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *5*(1), 39–68. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/S1366728902000135

Morales, J., Calvo, A., & Bialystok, E. (2013). Working Memory Development in Monolingual and Bilingual Children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *114*(2), 187–202. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2012.09.002

Müller, N. (1998). Transfer in bilingual first language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *1*(3), 151–171.

Nicoladis, E. (2006). Cross-linguistic transfer in adjective–noun strings by preschool bilingual children. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *9*(1), 15–32.

Nicoladis, E. (2012). Cross-linguistic influence in French–English bilingual children's possessive constructions. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *15*(2), 320–328.

Paradis, J. (2010). The interface between bilingual development and specific language impairment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *31*(2), 227–252. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/S0142716409990373

Paradis, J., & Genesee, F. (1996). Syntactic acquisition in bilingual children: Autonomous or interdependent? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18*(1), 1–25.

Puspani, I. A. M., & Indrawati, N. L. K. M. (2021). Challenges in translating Indonesian reduplication into English. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *17*(4), 1973–1983. https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.228248230349268

Ritonga, D. H., Sofyani, S., & Irsa, L. (2018). *Relationship Between Bilingual Environment and Indonesian Language Development in Children*. https://doi.org/10.2991/isphe-18.2018.65

Roelandt, K. (2014). (The) Most in Flemish Dutch: Definiteness and Specificity. In Pristine Perspectives on Logic, Language, and Computation. *ESSLLI 2012 and ESSLLI 2013 Student Sessions. Selected Papers*, 214–232.

Salamun, T. (2019). PERBANDINGAN POLA KONSTRUKSI POSESIF DIALEK AMBON DENGAN BAHASA INDONESIA BAKU [Comparison of Construction Possessive Pattern of Ambon Dialect With Indonesian Standard]. *Totobuang*, *7*(1), 43. https://doi.org/10.26499/ttbng.v7i1.123

Sánchez, M. T., & Brisk, M. E. (2004). Teacher's assessment practices and understandings in a bilingual program. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, *2*(1), 193–208.

Schiller, N. O., & Caramazza, A. (2003). Grammatical feature selection in noun phrase production: Evidence from German and Dutch. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *48*(1), 169–194.

Schott, E., Kremin, L. V, & Byers-Heinlein, K. (2021). *The Youngest Bilingual Canadians: Insights From the 2016 Census Regarding Children Aged 0-9*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/6q9jg

Serratrice, L. (2013). Cross-linguistic influence in bilingual development: Determinants and mechanisms. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, *3*(1), 3–25.

Serratrice, L., Sorace, A., Filiaci, F., & Baldo, M. (2012). Pronominal objects in English–Italian and Spanish–Italian bilingual children. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *33*(4), 725–751.

Serratrice, L., Sorace, A., & Paoli, S. (2004). Crosslinguistic influence at the syntax–pragmatics interface: Subjects and objects in English–Italian bilingual and monolingual acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *7*(3), 183–205.

Sorace, A., & Serratrice, L. (2009). Internal and external interfaces in bilingual language development: Beyond structural overlap. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *13*(2), 195–210.

Soriente, A. (2007). Cross-linguistic and cognitive structures in the acquisition of wh-questions in an Indonesian-Italian bilingual child. In *Cognitive aspects of bilingualism* (pp. 325–362). Springer.

Soriente, A. (2013). Language Development of Bilingual Children the Acquisition of Tense and Aspect in an Italian-Indonesian Child: A Case Study. *Wacana Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*, *15*(1), 131. https://doi.org/10.17510/wjhi.v15i1.108

Soriente, A. (2014). Studying linguistic and cultural contact in Borneo: prospects and challenges. *Antropologia*, *1*(1 NS), 59–81.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2005). The evolving sociopolitical context of immersion education in Canada: some implications for program development 1. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *15*(2), 169–186.

Tare, M., & Gelman, S. A. (2011). Bilingual Parents' Modeling of Pragmatic Language Use in Multiparty Interactions. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *32*(4), 761–780. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0142716411000051

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*.

Treffers-Daller, J., & Silva-Corvalán, C. (2016). *Language Dominance in Bilinguals: Issues of Measurement and Operationalization*. Cambridge University Press. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=070wCwAAQBAJ

Tribushinina, E., Irmawati, M., & Mak, P. (2021). Macrostructure in the Narratives of Indonesian-Dutch Bilinguals. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, *12*(4), 540–570. https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.20015.tri

Tribushinina, E., Mak, W. M., Andreiushina, E., Dubinkina, E., & Sanders, T. (2017). Connective use in the narratives of bilingual children and monolingual children with SLI. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *20*(1), 98–113.

Unsworth, S. (2013). Assessing the role of current and cumulative exposure in simultaneous bilingual acquisition: The case of Dutch gender. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *16*(1), 86–110.

Van Dijk, C., & Unsworth, S. (2023). On the relation between cross-linguistic influence, between-language priming and language proficiency: priming of ungrammatical adjective placement in bilingual Spanish-Dutch and French-Dutch children. *Open Mind*, *7*, 732–756.

Vásquez Carranza, L. M. (2007). Autonomy in simultaneus bilingualism: evidence from an English-Spanish bilingual child. *Káñina*, *31*(2). https://revistas.ucr.ac.cr/index.php/kanina/article/view/4581

Wei, L. (2007). *The Bilingualism Reader (2nd ed.)*. Routledge.

Wrembel, M. (2015). *In search of a new perspective: Cross-linguistic influence in the acquisition of third language phonology*.

Yip, V., & Matthews, S. (2000). Syntactic transfer in a Cantonese–English bilingual child. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *3*(3), 193–208.

Yip, V., & Matthews, S. (2006). Assessing language dominance in bilingual acquisition: A case for mean length utterance differentials. *Language Assessment Quarterly: An International Journal*, *3*(2), 97–116.

Biography of Authors

Mila Irmawati, MA is a lecturer at UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia and also a member of Cognitive, Affect and Well-being Laboratory at the Faculty of Psychology, University of Indonesia. She is an alumnus from bachelor program at the Faculty of Humanities, University of Indonesia. Also, an alumnus from Research Master Program in Linguistics at the Utrecht University, The Netherlands. Her research interest mainly related to psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, bilingualism, multilingualism, and language disorders.
Email: milairmawati@uinsgd.ac.id / mila.irmawati@alumni.ui.ac.id
Scopus ID: 57867309400

Bagus Pragnya Paramarta, S.S., M.Hum. is a lecturer at Mercu Buana University, Jakarta and STIBA Indonesia LPI, Jakarta, Indonesia. He is an alumnus of bachelor program at Al-Azhar University, Jakarta, Indonesia. Also, an alumnus from Master Program in Linguistics at the Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia. His research interest mainly focused on semantics, linguistic corpus, psycholinguistics, syntax, and semiotics.
Email: bagus.pragnya@mercubuana.ac.id