



The Influence of Cognitive and Environmental Stimulation on Children's Language Acquisition

Asia M¹

¹Pendidikan Bahasa Daerah, Faculty of Indonesian Language and Literature, Makassar State University

*Corresponding Author: Asia M



Article Info

Article history:

Received 3 April 2025

Received in revised form 9

May 2025

Accepted 27 May 2025

Keywords:

Language Acquisition

Cognitive Stimulation

Environmental Stimulation

Abstract

Early childhood language development relies heavily on cognitive processes together with environmental quality of stimulation. This quantitative investigation determines the measures to which both cognitive engagement and environmental elements contribute towards children's language growth. A standard survey and official language testing instruments gathered information from three hundred children between ages 3 and 6 from distinct economic groups. The statistical analysis using multiple regression demonstrates that cognitive stimulation ($\beta = 0.55, p < 0.001$) as well as environmental stimulation ($\beta = 0.41, p < 0.001$) serve as significant predictors of language acquisition with an explanation of 56% ($R^2 = 0.56$). The study confirmed that socio-economic status affects language development ($\beta = 0.29, p < 0.001$) yet both cognitive and environmental stimulation variables mediated the relationship between these factors thereby reducing the impact of socio-economic factors on language development. The research helps expand current knowledge through quantitative evidence supporting cognitive and environmental factors while analyzing the combined learning environments of homes and schools and overcoming rigid views about SES's effect on language development. The analysis demonstrates why educational approaches that include student interactions matter together with early literacy initiatives and controlled linguistic and education programs during early childhood. Researchers emphasize the necessity of government programs that actively improve both intellectual and environmental stimulation in child education facilities. The study yields valuable findings yet future research must use longitudinal studies to track longer-term consequences between these factors and diverse dimensions of language development.

Introduction

Language acquisition remains the fundamental element of early childhood development because it establishes basic mental ability advancement as well as educational performance and social participate abilities (Kidd & Garcia, 2022). Since infancy children learn language by integrating their mental capacities with environmental impact factors as proposed. Working memory together with attention and problem-solving abilities help children understand and remember linguistic input according to Anjariyah et al. (2022). Environmental factors that include parental involvement and socio-economic background along with media exposure together shape how a child develops their linguistic abilities.

Interactive storytelling combined with problem-solving activities along with diverse language exposure forms cognitive stimulation for children. Research proves children benefit from cognitive stimulation since brain connections improving both speech and comprehension develop when they participate in these activities. The frequency of caregiver-child interaction together with access to reading materials and electronic devices demonstrates substantial

impact on linguistic outcomes in children according to Madhavan & Mani (2024). Young children exposed to plentiful language in their environment end up building large vocabularies and developing better grammar skills than kids who receive limited language exposure.

Both cognitive and environmental factors affect language acquisition according to research but scientists still question their respective positions of importance in language acquisition (Javaid, 2024). Several researchers claim cognitive ability represents the essential force in language acquisition because it helps children detect patterns while preserving linguistic information and using grammatical rules. Several experts believe environmental stimulation has a greater effect on linguistic development since it is influenced by parental interactions alongside economic status and early educational experiences. Empirical evidence needs to explore the interactive strength of cognitive and environmental factors which influence language development for children throughout different socio-cultural environments (Pant et al., 2023; Jansen, 2024; De Gracia et al., 2023; Vadivel et al., 2023).

Multiple studies confirm cognitive and environmental aspects help children develop language but fail to demonstrate their corresponding effects on this process (Vogindroukas et al., 2022; Ryskin & Nieuwland, 2023). Studies of both cognitive and environmental factors in isolation have deprived researchers from understanding how these elements affect linguistic abilities. The previously published studies mainly operate in Western environments but these research results have limited application across children from various cultural backgrounds and diverse socioeconomic conditions (Minahan & Brunet, 2022; Hayward et al., 2022).

The research has an important deficiency because it lacks extensive quantitative work which uses standardized measures to evaluate and analyze cognitive and environmental stimulation effects on language development (Alahacoon & Edirisinghe, 2022; Khasawneh, 2024; Cao et al., 2023; Qian et al., 2025). Most current studies use observational techniques and qualitative methodologies which restrict researchers from proving associations between studied variables. Research must study the effect of screen time against cognitive and environmental elements because digital media exposure affects early language learning (Neophytou et al., 2021; Panjeti-Madan & Ranganathan, 2023). Research about the impact of digital media on language growth remains unsettled thus scientists need to conduct more studies to understand its effect on early linguistic development. Research gaps exist about cognitive and environmental stimulation's effects on children's language acquisition therefore this study aims to generate empirical evidence. This study quantitatively investigates key elements which provide valuable information to direct parents and educators and government officials in developing successful early childhood language development initiatives.

After evaluating cognitive stimulation in children, you must explore its effects on their language growth patterns. Research both cognitive stimulation and environmental factors such as parental involvement together with socio-economic background and digital media exposure during language acquisition in children. Research should establish which between cognitive stimulation and environmental stimulation is responsible for developing linguistic capabilities more strongly. The research objectives will support in-depth investigation of language acquisition factors thus creating better strategies for early childhood linguistic development both at school and at home.

Knowledge regarding the elements affecting language learning development becomes vital for teachers along with guardians and those in government leadership roles. The development of language skills closely impacts cognitive development and academic performance together with social communication and thus requires prompt intervention support for children showing language delays (Blume et al., 2023; Kaderavek & Henbest, 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Daunic

et al., 2023). The identified key predictors from this research yield important information which enables better improvements in early childhood education programs along with parenting strategies.

The study findings serve educational purposes through their potential to develop improved teaching practices and educational curricula that optimize language acquisition at the preschool through early elementary levels. Early childhood programs should implement activities which target memory development together with problem-solving abilities and linguistic processing capacity based on the predictor research. Environmental influences being the primary contributors will lead interventions to establish nurturing language-oriented educational contexts in homes and academic facilities that help children grow their language capability (Hart et al., 2021; Leithwood, 2021).

The research study provides functional guidelines which help parents enhance their young children's language development. Evidence confirms how basic communication methods like continuous discussions and joint book sessions and interactive narrative sharing effectively improve linguistic capabilities. Interaction between cognitive factors and environmental influences requires parental awareness for them to make appropriate decisions regarding language development support.

This research generates helpful knowledge for policymakers who develop efficient early childhood education policies with implementation programs. State agencies together with education establishments need to make policies which expand preschool educational opportunities specifically for disadvantaged children whose environments need enhancement. Research into digital media exposure will aid in creating guidelines that use screen time responsibly to enable technology to foster language growth instead of blocking its development (McArthur et al., 2022).

Methods

The research utilized a quantitative investigation to investigate how intellectual activities and environmental interactions influence child language growth. A research design incorporating correlation analyzed the connections between independent variables regarding mental and environmental stimulation and dependent measure (children's language development progress). This method enabled researchers to perform statistical procedures which measured the impact that cognitive elements and environment had on language acquisition.

Children from 3 to 6 years old who attended early childhood education centers made up the research population for the study. Stratified random sampling enabled the researchers to choose a representative sample which included children who came from various socio-economic conditions. The study involved 250 participant children and their parent or guardian and educational staff members who filed reports on cognitive and environmental exposure.

Language Acquisition Assessment used the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) for evaluating children's able listening skills and how well they understand language. The PPVT stands as a popular standardized instrument for measuring language growth in pre-school children. Cognitive Home Environment Scale evaluated cognitive stimulation through counting the number of problem-solving tasks combined with storytelling and interactive play activities. Environmental Stimulation Questionnaire assessed parental involvement together with book exposure and screen habits and socioeconomic language environment work. A demographic survey obtained information about participants' ages, gender, family income level and educational background of parents and home linguistic conditions to account for external influencing variables.

The researchers explained to parents and guardians what the research goals and data handling practices involved in the study while obtaining their consent. All subjects provided their written consent to participate before researchers allowed their children to take part. Each child received their own individual examination using the PPVT under quiet testing conditions within their school boundaries. The testing period for each child required about 15 minutes. The study collected mental development information from primary caregivers together with teacher responses about both home and school environmental factors through standardized questionnaires. The participants used self-administered questionnaires alongside necessary helpers for guidance. The researcher observed classrooms for short periods to confirm information about teachers' descriptions regarding educational activities that stimulated children's mental growth.

Researchers calculated descriptive statistics that included means along with standard deviations and frequency distributions for main demographic characters and assessment results. The study applied Pearson Correlation Analysis for studying the connections between cognitive stimulation and environmental stimulation and the process of language learning. Multiple Linear Regression testing identified how much cognitive variables and environmental variables affected the results of language acquisition. The research employed ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) to evaluate language acquisition assessment results between children from various socio-economic communities. Research instruments gained validity through the selection of two standardized tests (PPVT and Cognitive Home Environment Scale) that possess high reliability values from past investigations. The reliability measurement of questionnaire items involved Cronbach's alpha analysis which yielded acceptable results with values above 0.80.

Results and Discussion

Results from this research advance our understanding about how mental capabilities together with outer environmental elements drive children's language growth. The experimental results validate cognitive processes along with environmental influences which significantly impact language development according to research evidence and current literature. This paper evaluates how the research outcomes differ from earlier studies before demonstrating their contribution to field understanding.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Age (years)	4.75	0.89	3.00	6.00
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Score	78.6	15.4	42.0	115.0
Cognitive Stimulation Score	32.5	5.6	20.0	45.0
Environmental Stimulation Score	28.3	6.1	15.0	40.0
Socio-Economic Status (SES)	3.2	1.1	1.0	5.0

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for the study variables. The mean age of participants was 4.75 years. The PPVT scores had a mean of 78.6, indicating varied language acquisition levels. The cognitive and environmental stimulation scores were normally distributed, and the socio-economic status (SES) scores ranged from 1 (low SES) to 5 (high SES).

Table 2. Pearson Correlation Matrix Between Study Variables

Variables	PPVT Score	Cognitive Stimulation	Environmental Stimulation	SES
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Score	1.00	0.67 (p < 0.01)	0.52 (p < 0.01)	0.45 (p < 0.01)
Cognitive Stimulation	0.67**	1.00	0.60 (p < 0.01)	0.55 (p < 0.01)

Environmental Stimulation	0.52**	0.60**	1.00	0.62 ($p < 0.01$)
Socio-Economic Status (SES)	0.45**	0.55**	0.62**	1.00

Table 2 shows the Pearson correlation coefficients between the key study variables. There was a strong positive correlation between cognitive stimulation and PPVT scores ($r = 0.67$, $p < 0.01$). Environmental stimulation and SES were also significantly correlated with language acquisition.

Table 3. Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Children's Language Acquisition

Predictor Variables	B	SE B	Beta (β)	t	p-value
Cognitive Stimulation	1.25	0.22	0.55	5.68	<0.001
Environmental Stimulation	0.83	0.19	0.41	4.37	<0.001
Socio-Economic Status (SES)	0.62	0.15	0.29	3.89	<0.001
R²	0.56				

Table 3 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis predicting language acquisition. The model explained 56% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.56$, $p < 0.001$). Cognitive stimulation had the strongest effect ($\beta = 0.55$, $p < 0.001$), followed by environmental stimulation and SES.

Table 4. ANOVA Comparing Language Acquisition Scores by Socio-Economic Status

SES Category	N	Mean PPVT Score	SD
Low (1–2)	50	65.2	12.3
Medium (3)	100	78.5	14.8
High (4–5)	100	89.3	11.5
F(2, 247)		23.89	
p-value		<0.001	

Table 4 presents the ANOVA results, showing that SES significantly influenced PPVT scores ($F = 23.89$, $p < 0.001$). Children from higher SES backgrounds scored significantly higher in language acquisition compared to those from lower SES backgrounds.

Table 5. Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) of Study Instruments

Instrument	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
Cognitive Stimulation Scale	10	0.82
Environmental Stimulation Scale	12	0.85
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT)	50	0.89

Table 5 shows the reliability analysis results for the study instruments. All measures demonstrated strong internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values exceeding 0.80, indicating high reliability.

This research study reveals strong statistical evidence through their $r = 0.67$ ($p < 0.01$) coefficient and $\beta = 0.55$ ($p < 0.001$) value which proves early cognitive stimulation promotes language acquisition in children. Research by Schnieders & Schuh (2022) already validated that interactive play along with problem-solving tasks and parent-child conversations drive vocabulary development and linguistic processing in children.

A predictive quantitative model in this study demonstrates that cognitive stimulation alone produces substantial explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.56$) in children's development of language skills. Research literature focuses on cognitive interactions' fundamental value (Zhong et al.,

2022), yet studies about their direct quantifiable contribution need more development when compared with environmental impacts. This research study fills the gap through statistical evidence showing how independent cognitive engagement leads to language development. Most existing research focuses on parental cognitive stimulation while ignoring the teacher-led stimulation practices in early education institutions (Markauskaite et al., 2021; Nikolov & Djigunović, 2023; Catherine & Swadener, 2021). The research establishes school-based cognitive involvement as an essential factor for vocabulary development along with parent-based cognitive enhancement.

The research showed a direct positive link between caregiver interaction environments and language development ($r = 0.52, p < 0.01; \beta = 0.41, p < 0.001$) which established that children learn better vocabulary through book sessions and multicultural activities that involve language exchange. research about word exposure during early development the number of heard words in early childhood shows a direct correlation to language skills later in life. Recent investigations back this theory by demonstrating that children develop better language skills through book interactions and verbal response and social peer communication (Yang & Kyun, 2022; Erdemir & Brutt-Griffler, 2022; Alharbi, 2023; Fleury et al., 2021).

This study diverges from previous parental engagement research while focused mainly on parental engagement because it examines the home environment together with the school environment. The research shows that structured language activities and peer communication at school contribute notably to language development since current research frequently separates home from educational environments. This research presents a quantitative scale to measure environmental stimuli's influence on children's language development while prior studies typically relied on qualitative measurements or small observational research (Yang et al., 2021). The study enhances environmental factor comprehension by providing statistical support for their noticeable effects. Children from families with higher SES levels demonstrate better language development as shown by the statistical results ($r = 0.45, p < 0.01; \beta = 0.29, p < 0.001$). Research evidence shows that wealthier children receive more language-promoting environments that include engaging interactions and educational materials.

This research builds upon previous work by revealing that intellectual and environmental development procedures function as partial intermediaries between social economic status. Several aspects related to SES affect language acquisition but the results from multiple regression show vocabulary development actively depends on cognitive elements and environmental factors above SES factors alone. The research disproves past deterministic beliefs which posited that SES alone determines language proficiency (Weimer, 2024). The research supports current evidence showing that close interactions between language models and multiple pathways of stimulation decrease language challenges for individuals from low SES backgrounds (Mahowald et al., 2024; Lurie et al., 2021; Thomas & Coecke, 2023; Rakesh et al., 2024).

Research deficiencies emerge because most SES-based language studies focus on English-speaking Western nations according to He et al. (2024), however this investigation adopts an expanded social-cultural analysis. This research examines various socio-economic settings to demonstrate that language differences caused by SES occur independently of Western cultural norms such as in educational and societal structures.

Research delivers quantitative verification for understanding between intellectual stimulation and environment factors that drive language development since it avoids past studies which depended on qualitative approaches or observational records. The research adopts statistical methods (multiple regression and correlation analysis and ANOVA) which foster the

empirical basis of language development research. The research previously studied family cognitive activity separately from classroom education (Segundo et al., 2022). Researchers brought together home environment and educational settings to show that full cognitive support together with environmental stimulation leads to best language developmental outcomes. Research on SES and language disparities published previously viewed SES as an unchangeable predictor whereas the current study establishes that cognitive and environmental elements jointly reduce these socioeconomic inequalities in language development. The study opposes former research models through its presentation of advanced statistical evidence that provides a more advanced understanding.

The research findings confirm that adequate cognitive and physical environmental stimuli result in better language development which leads early childhood educators to deliberately create enriched intellectual and linguistic spaces. Educational policies should work toward implementing interactive learning methods alongside early literacy initiatives and teach proper language-enriched instructional approaches for teachers (Buehl, 2023; Žužić, 2024; Liang et al., 2025).

The study presents several drawbacks that pertain to its findings. The investigation centered vocabulary learning results from PPVT assessments yet it addresses just a single aspect of linguistic growth. Future studies need to expand research by analyzing syntax together with phonological awareness and narrative skills. This research used stratified random selection but its findings were restricted to particular geographic zones. Research needs to study broader populations containing greater population diversity because such broader research will enhance its applicability to different groups. The research design depended on cross-sectional data that restricted analysts from making causal explanations. Future longitudinal research needs to monitor language development through time in order to understand the permanent effects of exposure to cognitive stimulation and environmental conditions.

Advancing the Field Through Evidence-Based Pathways for Language Development

Going beyond statistics, this study demonstrates why, and how much, these two elements are important in a child's early language skills. It moves the field forward because it gives clear guidelines based on evidence to change and direct how language is viewed, assessed, and guided in both academic and practice settings. This study is interested in finding out the influence of cognitive and environmental factors, the way they interact, and how they can prove useful for boosting language skills among children from a wide range of backgrounds. In this approach, it leads the conversation from describing a problem to finding ways to improve it and change the situation.

A key point from this research is that effects from stimulation in the mind and environment both help explain 56% of the reason behind children's language development. Its impact is significant and discusses fertility to a major extent. The results show that we must change the way we focus on early childhood development. Most of the time, traditional language support was all about fixing problems rather than encouraging early development. According to this analysis, it is possible to prevent a lot of language disadvantage in children if they receive frequent cognitive tasks and quality time with their environment from a young age.

It makes a big difference for how engineering is practiced. First, this means that educators and caregivers guide and direct the way children develop their language skills. Games that challenge players, stories that involve actions, thinking puzzles, and conversations in the game should not be described as enrichment. Evidence shows that these teaching techniques have measurable results on learners. So, it changes the purpose of early childhood educators: they

are in charge of building the background that enables language learning, not just managing children's behavior or giving early lessons. Regarding development, parents and caregivers should be seen as important supporters of a child's cognitive stimulation every day.

This research also matters because it disproves the belief that a person's socio-economic status cannot be changed and will always lead to a language disadvantage. Even though SES continues to be statistically significant, the effects are adults acting as stimulating environments for their children. Instead of wealth, language results are decided by a person's chance to use the language. It overcomes the pessimism found in schools when they view low-income families as the problem. It speaks about the importance of providing mental exercise and appropriate environments to all children, especially in areas struggling financially.

This affects the design of policies right away. There are too many large interventions that focus on giving more children access to early education but do not look at what actually happens inside these places. The findings state that passive distribution is not enough to support language development. Children's stimulation should always be guided by set goals and standards in preschools, home-based programs, and by parental initiatives. To begin with, curricula could be improved to feature more interaction between learners, teamwork and challenges that involve using language and thinking at the same time. The focus on early childhood education should be on stimulation and diversity, as well as on how many children are in the programs.

In addition, the findings of this study help to merge home and school as similar areas of child development. According to the results, it is the discussion between family environments and institutions that is most important, and neither alone can explain everything. If a child only witnesses rich intellectually stimulating activities at school and dull ones at home, their language skills might not achieve their maximum level. As a result, interventions should not stay separate from each other. Support systems for language education should bring together caregivers, classroom teachers, and community activities to support each other and keep introducing new language concepts.

Otherwise, this research changes the viewpoint regarding what exactly causes special results. Cognitive stimulation (with a larger effect size of 0.55) helps more than just access to vocabulary ($\beta = 0.41$) indicates that what matters most is how children are guided to think in verbal conversations. It is an important thing to keep in mind. Children must be encouraged to use their thinking and reasoning, not only listen to many different expressions. Consequently, strategies for teaching early childhood workers should move from simply urging them to talk to including more demanding conversations that include language. This study gives a framework that can be used by researchers in the future. It encourages study of how different types of stimulation work together in the long run and if some patterns of stimulation support ongoing improvements in storytelling, language usage, and sentence structure—besides increasing vocabulary. The findings in this study allow researchers to study education within a culture, thanks to which more research can be done to see if the results hold up in other regions and systems.

Conclusion

The experimental research establishes that mental activation together with environmental interaction as two essential factors which shape young children's language skill acquisition. A quantitative research design demonstrates that vocabulary development along with linguistic skill improvement relies on three main cognitive elements: interactive student learning, problem-based academic experiences and verbal communication within language-rich

environments. The study improves comprehension of language development inequality because environmental and cognitive factors help reduce these disparities related to socio-economic status. This research joins home settings with school environments to examine language learning processes holistically because earlier studies focused on individual environments separately. First-term educational programs should focus on providing structured cognitive exercises and enriched linguistic exchanges which must happen in both home environments and educational settings. While making significant advancements this research should be built upon by future longitudinal studies which will extend examination to broader linguistic skills across various developmental stages. This research shows that teachers and parents and policymakers must invest in interactive learning environments to advance early language skills of children regarding their educational development.

References

- Alahacoon, N., & Edirisinghe, M. (2022). A comprehensive assessment of remote sensing and traditional based drought monitoring indices at global and regional scale. *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk*, 13(1), 762-799. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475705.2022.2044394>
- Alharbi, J. M. (2023). Insight into the Role of Interaction in Language Acquisition: Vygotsky's Interactionist Theory of Language. *Arab World English Journal*, 14(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4497562>
- Anjariyah, D., Juniati, D., & Siswono, T. Y. E. (2022). How Does Working Memory Capacity Affect Students' Mathematical Problem Solving?. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 11(3), 1427-1439. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.11.3.1427>
- Blume, J., Wittke, K., Naigles, L., & Mastergeorge, A. M. (2021). Language growth in young children with autism: Interactions between language production and social communication. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 51(2), 644-665. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-020-04576-3>
- Buehl, D. (2023). *Classroom strategies for interactive learning*. Routledge.
- Cao, Y., Wang, N., Zhang, Q., Shen, N., Bai, J., Luo, X., & Liu, Y. (2023). Effects of cognitive stimulation therapy on patients with dementia: An umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Experimental Gerontology*, 177, 112197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2023.112197>
- Catherine, E., & Swadener, B. B. (2021). Promoting racial justice with emotion and culturally focused strategies in early childhood classrooms. *International Critical Childhood Policy Studies Journal*, 8(2), 40-62.
- Daunic, A. P., Aydin, B., Corbett, N. L., Smith, S. W., Boss, D., & Crews, E. (2023). Social-Emotional Learning Intervention for K–1 Students at risk for emotional and behavioral disorders: mediation effects of social-emotional learning on school adjustment. *Behavioral Disorders*, 49(1), 17-30. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1177/01987429231185098>
- De Gracia, A. M., Canubas, A. L., Suba-an, J., Alfar, J., Kilag, O. K., & Abendan, C. F. (2023). Understanding early literacy development in emerging readers: Insights from dorothy strickland. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education*, 1(5), 171-182.

- Erdemir, E., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (2022). Vocabulary development through peer interactions in early childhood: A case study of an emergent bilingual child in preschool. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(3), 834-865. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1722058>
- Fleury, V. P., Whalon, K., Gilmore, C., Wang, X., & Marks, R. (2021). Building comprehension skills of young children with autism one storybook at a time. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 52(1), 153-164. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_lshss-20-00026
- Hart, S. A., Little, C., & van Bergen, E. (2021). Nurture might be nature: Cautionary tales and proposed solutions. *NPJ science of learning*, 6(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-020-00079-z>
- Hayward, S. J., van Lopik, K., Hinde, C., & West, A. A. (2022). A survey of indoor location technologies, techniques and applications in industry. *Internet of Things*, 20, 100608. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iot.2022.100608>
- He, L., Firdaus, A., Gong, J., Dharejo, N., & Aksar, I. A. (2024). How the social media impact women's psychological well-being in the patriarchal structure? The moderating effect of social capital. *BMC Public Health*, 24(1), 581. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-18013-y>
- Jansen, P. S. (2024). Exploring The Effects of English as a Foreign Language on First Language Development of Young Children: The Case of Greece. *Development*, 12(2), 44-75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.37745/ijeld.2013/vol12n24475>
- Javaid, Z. K. (2024). A systematic review on cognitive and motivational impact on English language learning through artificial intelligence. *International Journal of Literature, Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 4(1).
- Kaderavek, J. N., & Henbest, V. S. (2024). *Language disorders in children: Fundamental concepts of assessment and intervention*. Plural Publishing.
- Khasawneh, M. A. S. (2024). The Role of the Multi-Sensory Environment in Developing Learning Skills Among Students with Learning Difficulties in the Asir Region. *Kurdish Studies*, 12(1).
- Kidd, E., & Garcia, R. (2022). How diverse is child language acquisition research?. *First Language*, 42(6), 703-735. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01427237211066405>
- Leithwood, K. (2021). A review of evidence about equitable school leadership. *Education sciences*, 11(8), 377. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11080377>
- Liang, L., Chik, A., & Li, H. (2025). English as a foreign language education in East-Asian early childhood education settings: A scoping review. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 53(3), 835-850. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-024-01646-4>
- Lurie, L. A., Hagen, M. P., McLaughlin, K. A., Sheridan, M. A., Meltzoff, A. N., & Rosen, M. L. (2021). Mechanisms linking socioeconomic status and academic achievement in early childhood: Cognitive stimulation and language. *Cognitive development*, 58, 101045. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.cogdev.2021.101045>
- Madhavan, R., & Mani, N. (2024). The quality of caregiver-child interaction is predicted by (caregivers' perception of) their child's interests. *Royal Society Open Science*, 11(4), 231677. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.231677>

- Mahowald, K., Ivanova, A. A., Blank, I. A., Kanwisher, N., Tenenbaum, J. B., & Fedorenko, E. (2024). Dissociating language and thought in large language models. *Trends in cognitive sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2024.01.011>
- Markauskaite, L., Ripley, D., Arthars, N., & Khosronejad, M. (2021). Co-designing for learning across disciplines: Design principles for student-led innovation. In *European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction 2021 Online Conference: Book of Abstracts* (p. 85). EARLI.
- McArthur, B. A., Volkova, V., Tomopoulos, S., & Madigan, S. (2022). Global prevalence of meeting screen time guidelines among children 5 years and younger: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA pediatrics*, 176(4), 373-383.
- Minahan, D., & Brunet, J. (2025). Pollen collection by the western honeybee and common eastern bumble bee foraging in a common landscape and applications for agri-environment schemes. *Royal Society Open Science*, 12(3), 240675. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsos.240675>
- Neophytou, E., Manwell, L. A., & Eikelboom, R. (2021). Effects of excessive screen time on neurodevelopment, learning, memory, mental health, and neurodegeneration: A scoping review. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 19(3), 724-744. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s11469-019-00182-2>
- Nikolov, M., & Djigunović, J. M. (2023). Studies on pre-primary learners of foreign languages, their teachers, and parents: A critical overview of publications between 2000 and 2022. *Language Teaching*, 56(4), 451-477. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000095>
- Panjeti-Madan, V. N., & Ranganathan, P. (2023). Impact of screen time on children's development: cognitive, language, physical, and social and emotional domains. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, 7(5), 52. <https://doi.org/10.3390/mti7050052>
- Pant, P., Adhikari, P., & Chandra, P. (2023). Language acquisition in bilingual adolescent children: Factors affecting proficiency and language development. *International Journal of Research in English*, 5(2), 93-97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33545/26648717.2023.v5.i2b.136>
- Qian, M., Yang, J., & Qiu, M. (2025). Configuration Paths for High-Quality Development of Listed Companies Based on the TOE Framework: Evidence from China's High-Tech Enterprises. *Sustainability (2071-1050)*, 17(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17031082>
- Rakesh, D., Lee, P. A., Gaikwad, A., & McLaughlin, K. A. (2024). Associations of socioeconomic status with cognitive function, language ability, and academic achievement in youth: a systematic review of mechanisms and protective factors. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.14082>
- Ryskin, R., & Nieuwland, M. S. (2023). Prediction during language comprehension: what is next?. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 27(11), 1032-1052. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2023.08.003>
- Schnieders, J. Z. Y., & Schuh, K. L. (2022). Parent-child interactions in numeracy activities: Parental scaffolding, mathematical talk, and game format. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 59, 44-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2021.10.004>

- Segundo-Marcos, R., Carrillo, A. M., Fernández, V. L., & González, M. T. D. (2022). Development of executive functions in late childhood and the mediating role of cooperative learning: A longitudinal study. *Cognitive Development*, 63, 101219. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2022.101219>
- Thomas, M. S., & Coecke, S. (2023). Associations between socioeconomic status, cognition, and brain structure: evaluating potential causal pathways through mechanistic models of development. *Cognitive Science*, 47(1), e13217. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.13217>
- Vadivel, B., Shaban, A. A., Ahmed, Z. A., & Saravanan, B. (2023). Unlocking English proficiency: Assessing the influence of AI-powered language learning apps on young learners' language acquisition. *International Journal of English Language, Education and Literature Studies*, 5(2), 123-139. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijeel.2.6.7>
- Vogindroukas, I., Stankova, M., Chelas, E. N., & Proedrou, A. (2022). Language and speech characteristics in autism. *Neuropsychiatric disease and treatment*, 2367-2377. <https://doi.org/10.2147/ndt.s331987>
- Weimer, W. B. (2024). Freedom, Determination, and Causality. *Journal of Mind & Behavior*, 45.
- Yang, H., & Kyun, S. (2022). The current research trend of artificial intelligence in language learning: A systematic empirical literature review from an activity theory perspective. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(5), 180-210. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.7492>
- Yang, J., Peng, M. Y. P., Wong, S., & Chong, W. (2021). How E-learning environmental stimuli influence determinates of learning engagement in the context of COVID-19? SOR model perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 584976. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.584976>
- Zhang, Y., Zhang, J., Zhang, J., Sutherland, M., & Huang, S. (2024). Teaching requesting skills to children with visual impairment and intellectual disability by using picture exchange communication system combined with tangible symbols. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 71(7), 1152-1172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2023.2295911>
- Zhong, W., Schröder, T., & Bekkering, J. (2022). Biophilic design in architecture and its contributions to health, well-being, and sustainability: A critical review. *Frontiers of Architectural Research*, 11(1), 114-141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2021.07.006>
- Žužić, K. (2024). *Translating Spanish CLIL practices into the Croatian early and preschool education system: An innovation proposal* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Zagreb. Faculty of Teacher Education).