p-ISSN 2301-7554, e-ISSN 2541-3643
Volume 14, Issue 3, October 2026

ENGLISH REVIEW
Journal of English Education
Published by
English Language Study Program, Faculty of Teachers Training & Education, Universitas Kuningan, Indonesia in collaboration with AISEE (The Association of Indonesian Scholars of English Education)
AISEE

HYBRID ENGLISH HOME LITERACY ECOLOGIES: MOTHERS' ACCOUNTS OF PRINT-DIGITAL INTEGRATION IN AN INDONESIAN EFL CONTEXT

Dewi Ulya Mailasari[1], Agus Wahyudi[2]
[1,2]*Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kudus, Indonesia*

Corresponding author: dewiulya@uinsuku.ac.id

APA Citation: Mailasari, D. U., & Wahyudi, A. (2026). Hybrid English home literacy ecologies: Mothers' accounts of print-digital integration in an Indonesian EFL context. *English Review: Journal of English Education, 14*(3), 1199-1212. https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v14i3.330

Received: 29-06-2026 Accepted: 28-08-2026 Published: 30-10-2026

Abstract: Young children's encounters with English span print and digital media, but the relationships among these resources, parental mediation, and everyday routines remain insufficiently described in Indonesian EFL homes. This qualitative descriptive study examined written accounts from eight university-educated, employed mothers of four- to five-year-old children in urban Indonesia. A bilingual online open-ended questionnaire and individual written follow-up clarifications generated the data. Reflexive thematic analysis combined within-participant profiling with cross-participant comparison. Books, songs, online videos, games, and subtitled films occupied different roles according to how mothers selected resources, participated in activities, and located English within family routines. Background audio, co-viewing, joint singing, questioning, and conversational extension represented distinct forms of participation. Four provisional configurations summarized these relationships: print-anchored, digitally supported, interaction-centered hybrid, and distributed hybrid. They describe organizing emphases rather than fixed household types or levels of quality. The study contributes a relational account of English home literacy that distinguishes resource availability from the reported organization of resources, mediation, and exposure. Some accounts established complementary resource use without documenting direct transfers between print and digital activities. Because data comprised eight mothers' self-reports and no child assessments, the configurations cannot establish the effectiveness of these practices for English development.
Keywords: *home literacy environment; early childhood EFL; hybrid literacy ecology; parental mediation; print-digital integration*

INTRODUCTION

Young children's home literacy encompasses printed texts, digital content, conversation, and play. Recent research distinguishes traditional and digital dimensions of the home literacy environment (HLE), while reviews show that digital language and literacy practices are embedded in varied family activities (El Gemayel et al., 2026; Yuan et al., 2024). Describing the resources present in a home, however, does not explain how they are used together. A book and a video may support separate activities, supplement one another within a routine, or become connected through an adult's questions and subsequent conversation. This study therefore examines the relationships among resources, maternal mediation, English exposure, and everyday routines in eight Indonesian mothers' accounts. The relevant distinction is between possessing or using several resources and organizing them into a reported literacy ecology.

HLE research establishes that access to texts, literacy activities, and caregiver involvement are distinct dimensions rather than interchangeable indicators of a single resource level. The foundational home literacy model differentiates practices associated with oral language and written-language learning (Sénéchal & LeFevre, 2002). More recent evidence emphasizes contextual and relational variation: a meta-analysis across low- and middle-income countries reports a small overall association with children's language

and literacy, while research on maternal and paternal HLE identifies partly distinct caregiver contributions (Li et al., 2024; Nag et al., 2024). Person-oriented research also identifies different combinations of books and activities rather than assuming that all dimensions rise together (Bai et al., 2025). Collectively, this work establishes the multidimensional nature of HLE. What remains less clear for the present inquiry is how particular combinations acquire an organizing role within everyday English routines. The study addresses that question through descriptions of resource functions and relationships, without estimating associations with child outcomes.

Research on print and digital literacy distinguishes the medium from the activity it supports. Studies separating paper- and tablet-based practices, together with broader reviews of digital language and literacy education, show that findings depend on the practices, skills, and technologies examined (Jáñez et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2024). The evidence does not establish a general advantage of digital exposure. For example, vocabulary research reports no positive association with digital use in one preschool sample, whereas an Indonesian randomized intervention using digital storybooks and reading games produced gains among first graders at risk (Adam et al., 2025; Sundqvist et al., 2024). These findings concern different ages, designs, activities, and outcomes and should not be treated as contradictory tests of the same proposition. They establish the need to distinguish digital activities and their contexts. They leave a complementary descriptive question: how do families connect, or simply alternate between, print and digital resources when organizing preschool English at home?

Parental mediation provides a third strand of evidence. Reviews distinguish content selection and regulation from adult participation in children's digital activity; evidence on co-use and media design further indicates that adult-child engagement cannot be inferred from the presence of a device alone (Mathers, Kolancali, et al., 2025; Soyoof et al., 2024; Taylor et al., 2024). Research on digital shared reading and parental perspectives also identifies practical demands, including responding to medium-specific features, children's reactions to interruptions, and parents' confidence in the language being used (Mao & Pesco, 2025; Nicholas & Paatsch, 2024). This literature establishes mediation as a situated practice rather than a yes-or-no parental attribute. Less well specified is how selection, co-presence, verbal prompting, and extension across activities differentiate the organization of English within the same household repertoire. Accordingly, the present analysis distinguishes these forms of participation and treats unreported interaction as unknown rather than as evidence of either passive or active engagement.

A fourth strand concerns the language and routine in which literacy activity occurs. Research with Korean-English bilingual children and Chinese children learning English links home practices to language-specific skills and interests, while longitudinal work also identifies child-to-parent and between-caregiver relationships (Jiang & Lau, 2025; Kim & Yim, 2024; Liu & Chung, 2025; Zhang & Lau, 2026). Evidence from Malaysian multilingual homes similarly associates interactional scaffolding with reported English proficiency beyond material access alone (Jin et al., 2026). Together, these studies establish that an English HLE cannot be inferred from a general resource inventory or a single caregiver's characteristics. They do not, however, fully describe the particular combinations of media, maternal participation, and routine placement examined here. The present study adds a bounded account of whether English is organized around specific events or reported across multiple activities, while recognizing that these descriptions do not measure language dosage or establish household bilingual status.

The analytical framework draws on multiliteracies and a relational understanding of the home. The New London Group (1996) situates meaning-making across linguistic, visual, audio, and other modes, while Flewitt and Clark (2020) conceptualize digitally networked home literacy through connections among people, texts, and settings. Building on these foundations, hybrid English home literacy ecology is used here as a contextual analytical descriptor, not a newly validated construct. Resources are the materials and media named by mothers. An ecology concerns their reported relationships: which activity organizes participation, how the mother mediates it, where English enters, and how the activity fits into family life. Evidence of shared resources across a household does not by itself establish a direct book-to-video sequence or transfer of story content. The analysis therefore distinguishes explicit interactional connections, reported supplementation across routines, and connections that remain insufficiently described.

p-ISSN 2301-7554, e-ISSN 2541-3643
Volume 14, Issue 3, October 2026

The Indonesian EFL context and research gap

The Indonesian EFL context makes this question more specific than a general account of media use. English occupies a context-dependent position within a multilingual environment involving Indonesian, regional languages, and other language resources (Zein, 2020). Where English is not the usual language of family interaction, access may be concentrated in selected books, songs, videos, games, or planned learning events. Mothers' choices about materials and participation can therefore help delimit when English becomes available. Indonesian research already links home literacy to preschool reading and examines digital home interventions and toddlers' EFL exposure (Adam et al., 2025; Bungsudi et al., 2026; Kusumawardhani et al., 2025). These contributions establish relevant home and digital practices, but they address different developmental groups and research questions. The present inquiry focuses on the joint organization of print, digital resources, mediation, and routine placement among four- to five-year-olds. Indonesia's EFL setting is treated as context, not as evidence that every participating household uses English only occasionally; some mothers described it as a main language of home interaction.

The gap is therefore relational and contextual. Previous research establishes that HLE is multidimensional, that digital practices vary, and that caregiver interaction and language context matter. What remains insufficiently explained for this bounded Indonesian group is how these elements are organized together: what anchors an English activity, how other resources support it, what the mother does, and whether English remains within that event or recurs elsewhere. The gap is not an absence of research on Indonesian mothers or digital media, nor a claim that earlier HLE scholarship ignores interaction. Eight mothers' written accounts offer a focused way to describe these relationships and contrasts. Each account represents one mother's perspective and cannot establish the entire family's language ecology.

Against this background, this qualitative descriptive study explores how eight university-educated, employed mothers of children aged four to five describe English home literacy in urban Indonesia. It examines resource integration, maternal participation, and the placement of English within everyday routines. Cross-participant configurations are used to summarize organizing emphases rather than to rank households. The study addresses three research questions: (1) How do Indonesian mothers integrate print and digital resources into their children's early English literacy routines? (2) How are these resources mediated through parent-child interaction, and how is English exposure distributed across daily routines? (3) What provisional configurations of hybrid English home literacy emerge from cross-participant comparison?

The intended contribution has three levels. Empirically, the study provides detailed, context-bound accounts from an underrepresented group of Indonesian EFL homes. Conceptually, it connects media, mediation, English exposure, and routines within a common analytical account; the four configurations distinguish what organizes those relationships, extending resource- and activity-based HLE descriptions without claiming a validated typology. Practically, the accounts offer examples that parents and educators can discuss when organizing feasible English activities around existing family routines. These contributions concern reported organization and participation. They neither establish which configuration is preferable nor demonstrate improvements in children's language or literacy.

METHOD

This qualitative descriptive study, situated within an interpretivist orientation, examined how eight Indonesian mothers described early English literacy at home. Qualitative description suits research seeking a contextual account close to participants' language rather than theory building or causal explanation (Hall & Liebenberg, 2024). Because each household was represented by one mother's questionnaire and individual clarification responses, the study was not treated as a formal multiple-case design. Each complete response set instead formed an analytic profile for within-participant description and cross-participant comparison.

Analysis addressed print-digital integration, parental mediation, and the distribution of English across daily routines. Child language or literacy outcomes were not measured; consequently, the configurations are provisional interpretive summaries rather than validated household types or claims about effectiveness.

Participants were eight mothers living in urban settings in Indonesia. Coded A–H, they were 29–36 years old, held at least a bachelor's degree, and were in paid employment as teachers, lecturers, a physician, or private-sector employees. The sample therefore represented a relatively

educationally advantaged and professionally employed urban group whose members reported using print and/or digital resources to provide English exposure at home. These characteristics provide contextual boundaries for interpreting transferability while avoiding disclosure of specific locations. Each participant had a child aged four or five who encountered English at home. Complete household language repertoires were not systematically recorded; consequently, the study describes mothers' reported English-related practices rather than classifying households by bilingual status. To reduce deductive identification in this small, professionally recruited sample, city-level locations are not reported.

Table 1. *Participant profile*

Code	Mother's age (years)	Highest degree	Occupation	Child's age (years)	Reported timing of English activities
A	36	Bachelor's	Teacher	4	depending on school homework
B	30	Master's	Lecturer	4	Twice a week
C	34	Bachelor's	Physician	5	Almost every day
D	35	Bachelor's	Private-sector employee	5	There is no specific time allocation
E	29	Master's	Lecturer	4	30 minutes before bed every day
F	35	Bachelor's	Teacher	4	Twice a week
G	30	Bachelor's	Private-sector employee	5	2 or 3 times a week
H	33	Bachelor's	Private-sector employee	4	1 hour; recurrence not specified

Note. Timing descriptions retain the mothers' reported units and are not comparable measures of total exposure. For H, the recurrence of the one-hour period was not specified. The timing entry for A concerns homework, whereas her wider account also describes English in home communication.

Criterion-based purposive sampling required participants to reside in an urban setting in Indonesia, hold at least a bachelor's degree, be in paid employment, have a four- or five-year-old child, intentionally provide the child with English exposure at home, and be willing to provide detailed written responses in Indonesian or English. Initial invitations were disseminated through professional networks and colleague recommendations, followed by referrals to other mothers who met the eligibility criteria. The resulting sample was small and criterion-focused. Its relative homogeneity, together with complete written response sets and targeted individual clarifications, supported intensive within-participant profiling and cross-participant comparison across the four analytic dimensions. The study sought information-rich comparison within this bounded group rather than population representation or thematic saturation; no claim of saturation is made.

Data were generated through a bilingual online qualitative questionnaire administered through Google Forms. Such questionnaires can elicit reflective written accounts when open questions are sequenced clearly and aligned with an interpretive purpose (Thomas et al., 2024). The instrument comprised eight open-ended questions and was available in Indonesian and English, allowing participants to respond in either language. Questions addressed parental rationales, print and digital resources, routine organization, parent-child mediation, and the distribution of English across daily activities.

The domains drew on home literacy, multiliteracies, and digitally mediated family literacy research (New London Group, 1996; Sénéchal & LeFevre, 2002; Soyoof et al., 2024). Example prompts asked how mothers introduced English in everyday activities, which resources they used and why, and how they interacted with children during books, songs, or videos. Completion took approximately 30 minutes.

Two specialists in early childhood English education and literacy reviewed the instrument for clarity and relevance. Their feedback informed wording revisions. A pilot with two individuals meeting similar criteria then tested question clarity and response richness; minor revisions preceded final distribution.

Data were collected over three months, from June to August 2025. Before data collection, all participants provided digital informed consent through the questionnaire. The consent form described the study purpose, voluntary participation, withdrawal without consequence, academic use of the data, confidentiality, and data protection. Participants then had approximately

p-ISSN 2301-7554, e-ISSN 2541-3643
Volume 14, Issue 3, October 2026

seven days to complete the questionnaire. After eight written response sets were received, the researcher contacted participants individually in writing when clarification was needed. Follow-up prompts addressed incomplete or ambiguous descriptions, particularly the frequency of routines, resource functions, and parent-child interaction; each clarification was appended to the relevant participant's response set. No focus-group data were collected. Thus, the dataset comprised eight self-reported written accounts and associated individual clarifications, not home observations or child assessments. The findings are therefore based on mothers' accounts rather than independent observations of children's behavior or learning outcomes.

Participants could respond in Indonesian or English. Responses were read and coded in the language in which they were submitted so that analysis remained anchored in the original wording. Indonesian excerpts selected for reporting were translated into English during manuscript preparation. The authors cross-checked each translated excerpt against the original response and resolved wording choices through discussion, prioritizing semantic equivalence over literal translation. The original-language responses remained the reference point whenever an expression was ambiguous.

Reflexive thematic analysis treated coding and pattern development as active interpretation rather than mechanical discovery or coder consensus (Braun & Clarke, 2021, 2022). After repeated reading, the researcher developed mainly semantic, data-led codes for resources, routines, mediation, and English use. Home literacy, multiliteracies, and parental mediation literature served as sensitizing concepts rather than a fixed coding frame.

Codes were first assembled into an analytic profile for each participant. The eight profiles were then compared in a matrix to identify convergences, divergences, and recurring combinations across four dimensions. Candidate configurations were checked against the complete response sets, including contradictory evidence, and their labels and boundaries were revised iteratively.

The dimensions in Table 2 were interpretive tools, not standardized scales. No numerical scores or population thresholds were used. For reporting, a resource inventory was distinguished from an account of how resources were organized around maternal participation and a routine. Direct connections were described only where the account specified them; a list of books and videos alone was not treated as evidence that their content was linked. Comparative terms refer to organizing emphases within this dataset, not to interactional quality, learning effectiveness, or exposure thresholds. The configurations are provisional and may overlap.

Table 2. *Analytic dimensions used for cross-participant comparison*

Dimension	Narrative evidence considered	Analytical distinction
Print centrality	Books, environmental print, shared reading, and their reported place in a routine.	Print as an organizing anchor, a complement, or a less described resource; centrality is not a quality score.
Digital integration	Songs, videos, games, applications, and subtitled media; the functions and connections actually described.	Direct interactional connection, supplementation across activities, or resource coexistence with the connection unspecified.
Parental mediation	Selection, background provision, co-use, questioning, modeling, and extension into talk or play.	Access, accompaniment, joint performance, and verbal participation are distinct. Unreported interaction remains unknown.
Exposure distribution	The activities and contexts in which English is reported, together with any stated timing.	Concentration in a bounded event versus distribution across contexts; breadth and recurrence are not measures of quality or learning.

Participants received a summary of their own reported routines and could correct inaccuracies or add detail. This process supported descriptive accuracy and participant feedback but was not treated as automatic validation of the wider interpretation, consistent with recent methodological arguments that member checking should be used reflexively rather than as a mechanical guarantee of credibility (Kullman & Chudyk, 2025; Lloyd et al., 2024). A qualitative-research colleague reviewed sample codes and preliminary interpretations to question assumptions and refine configuration boundaries, not to calculate inter-coder reliability.

An audit trail recorded codes, participant profiles, matrix comparisons, and revisions.

Divergent evidence was retained, and claims were kept within the limits of self-report. Together, these practices foregrounded coherence, contextual sensitivity, transparency, and reflexive engagement (Braun & Clarke, 2021; Cena et al., 2024).

Formal ethics committee approval was not obtained for this minimal-risk, non-interventional study. In the absence of formal review, the authors conducted an ethical self-assessment covering the study purpose, recruitment, consent, privacy, data security, and potential risks. The assessment classified the study as minimal risk because the participants were competent adults completing a non-sensitive questionnaire about household literacy practices; no intervention occurred, no data were collected directly from children, and no compensation was provided. Before participation, the mothers received information about the study purpose, voluntary participation, academic use of data, withdrawal without consequence, confidentiality, and data protection, and then provided digital informed consent. Names and direct identifiers were not collected; alphabetical codes (A-H) were used, and study materials were stored securely with access limited to the researchers. Because recruitment used professional networks, invitations stated that participation or refusal would have no professional consequences. This statement reports the ethical route used and does not constitute retrospective institutional approval.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are organized around the three research questions. Within each subsection, recurring patterns are first described through cross-participant comparison, then illustrated with selected excerpts, and finally interpreted in relation to relevant scholarship. Because the dataset consists of written self-reports and follow-up clarifications, the analysis describes reported practices; it does not verify their frequency through observation or establish effects on children's English development.

RQ1. Integrating print and digital resources within daily routines

Print functioned as an anchor rather than an exclusive mode

Printed materials appeared in most participant profiles, but their reported role differed. Participant B described deliberate selection: "I use graded English books that are appropriate to my child's developmental stage." She estimated that "approximately 80% of the exposure comes from books, and 20% from YouTube." Participant E reported an approximately 30-minute daily bedtime-reading routine, with digital materials in a supplementary position. These accounts indicate a book-led repertoire and, for E, a stable routine anchor. B's estimate is a participant characterization, not a measured allocation of time. Neither account, as reported here, establishes that a particular video revisited the content of a particular book. Thus, print-digital coexistence and supplementation are supported more clearly than episode-by-episode content integration.

These accounts align with traditional HLE research in assigning shared reading an identifiable role, while adding detail about how that role coexists with digital materials (Sénéchal & LeFevre, 2002; Yuan et al., 2024). They also qualify a purely media-separated interpretation of HLE: media-specific practices can remain distinct within a single book-led household repertoire. Jáñez et al. (2024) examined paper- and tablet-based practices against reading outcomes in older children; the present accounts instead describe how mothers position resources around preschool English routines. The analytical addition is therefore the distinction between print centrality and print exclusivity. A routine can be anchored in books while other media supplement the repertoire, without assuming balanced use or superior child outcomes.

Digital resources extended the repertoire and temporal reach of English

Digital resources took several forms. Participant F foregrounded English songs and YouTube and described a shared activity as "Sing English children songs together." Participant G combined books, games, and films and stated, "We accompany children watching English language films with English subtitles." Subtitles made written English available alongside speech, but the account does not show whether the child attended to or decoded them. Participant D described songs playing in the background during household activities. These examples locate digital resources differently: as material for joint performance, an accompanied audiovisual activity, or ambient audio. They demonstrate differences in participation and routine placement, not equivalent instances of interactive literacy or evidence that all digital use was actively mediated.

This interpretation extends digital-reading research by locating digital resources within a wider English repertoire that includes songs, films,

p-ISSN 2301-7554, e-ISSN 2541-3643
Volume 14, Issue 3, October 2026

and everyday talk. Work on shared digital storybooks describes the need to adapt adult participation to the medium, while a broader review distinguishes technologies and literacy skills rather than treating digital delivery as a single intervention (Liu et al., 2024; Nicholas & Paatsch, 2024). Outcome findings also set an important boundary: digital storybooks and games supported first graders in an Indonesian trial, but digital use showed no positive vocabulary association in another preschool study (Adam et al., 2025; Sundqvist et al., 2024). Differences in age, activity structure, and research design limit direct comparison. The present study contributes descriptions of reported functions; it cannot reproduce, refute, or generalize those outcome effects.

RQ1 is therefore answered at two levels. Mothers reported complementary use of print and digital resources, but explicit connections were clearest where an activity included identifiable adult participation, such as singing together or accompanying a subtitled film. Connections between a specific printed text and digital content were less fully documented. A literacy-ecology interpretation adds the activity, the participant's role, and the routine to the resource description; it does not turn every mention of books and devices into evidence of integrated learning. This qualification is especially relevant to the digitally supported profile, where the relationship with print remains weakly specified.

RQ2. Mediating resources and distributing English across everyday life

Mediation occurred through talk, questioning, co-use, and extension

Across the accounts, mediation involved what mothers did around a resource, not only which resource they supplied. Participant H described using simple English questions to invite choices and recount events:

> When asking for children's opinions, we usually ask them using simple English sentences. For example, "Which one do you want? This one or that one?" Or "What do you want to eat today?" Or "How was your day? Did you play with your favorite toy at school?" And let the children answer in simple English according to their ability. (Participant H)

Other profiles showed related but distinct participation. Participant C reported play-based prompts involving objects and environmental print. Participant F described singing with the child, whereas Participant G described accompanying subtitled-film viewing. Participant B connected shared reading with everyday conversation. These accounts permit distinctions among modeling or joint performance, physical co-presence, questioning, and conversational extension. Co-viewing establishes accompaniment but does not automatically establish explanation, questioning, or responsive turn-taking. Likewise, a mother can select English audio without interacting throughout its playback. The analytical question is what participation is actually described around the material, rather than whether the household has been assigned a general label of active mediation.

The distinctions help explain how similar digital resources can occupy different roles. D's background songs provided ambient English during other activities; F's joint singing made the song a shared performance. H's questions invited an answer, while G's account established co-viewing without specifying the accompanying talk. Background audio is not equivalent to questioning, but it is also insufficient evidence that the child's engagement was wholly passive. Selection concerns access; co-presence concerns companionship; modeling and questioning organize an immediate exchange; extension connects English with another activity. These are different reported functions, not a measured scale from poor to high-quality parenting. Their duration, responsiveness, and the child's participation were not observed.

These contrasts align with research distinguishing meaning- and code-focused shared-reading practices across media and with observations of different interaction patterns during reading and play (Mathers, Hodgkiss, et al., 2025; Nastasiuk et al., 2024). They extend that work descriptively by separating accompaniment from the questioning or joint performance explicitly reported here. Screen-exposure research asks a different question: its association with reduced parent-child talk cannot establish the interaction in a particular co-viewed episode (Brushe et al., 2024). Similarly, findings on screen use and HLE in vocabulary trajectories do not make background audio equivalent to a responsive exchange (Lu et al., 2026). This distinction prevents a resource label or exposure frequency from substituting for evidence about participation.

English exposure ranged from bounded events to distributed daily use

The profiles also differed in where and when English was reported. E located it in a stable bedtime-reading event. B described a book-led pattern supplemented by YouTube and conversation. A and D characterized English as part of home communication, while G described communication, books, games, and subtitled films. The timing entries in Table 1 capture different kinds of information: an activity's frequency, an episode's duration, or the absence of a fixed allocation. They cannot be combined into a comparable exposure score. D offered the clearest illustration of English distributed across household activities:

> From the moment I wake up, I greet my children in English. We fill our daily activities with English communication (mother and child). Throughout the day, when the children are doing activities around the house, there are always English songs playing in the background. (Participant D)

A similarly characterized English as the main home language, while her timing entry referred to school homework. G reported two or three occasions a week while describing several types of activity. These statements show why breadth of contexts and frequency of scheduled events must be distinguished; they do not establish an all-day dose. H's entry of one hour provides a duration without specifying recurrence. Accordingly, bounded and distributed refer to the placement of English in the accounts. A distributed repertoire can contain infrequent or weakly interactive episodes, while a bounded event can involve detailed parent-child talk; the available data do not permit a quality comparison.

This routine-based description complements second-language HLE research by asking where English enters family life, rather than whether a higher activity score predicts proficiency. Longitudinal findings identify reciprocal relations between English skills and home practices and interactions between mothers' and fathers' HLE (Jiang & Lau, 2025; Liu & Chung, 2025). The present data cannot establish those temporal or between-caregiver processes, because they provide one mother's written perspective at one period. Their contribution is to distinguish concentration within an event from use across different events. That distinction may help future work separate exposure breadth, recurrence, interlocutor, and participation instead of combining them into a single measure of English support.

RQ2 is answered through the relationship between maternal participation and routine placement. Songs could accompany household activity or become joint performances; films could be accompanied, while conversation could extend English beyond a text. These differences describe the social organization of access and participation. All mothers were employed, but the accounts did not systematically connect configurations to their work schedules. Employment, education, English proficiency, and digital literacy therefore cannot explain the differences on the evidence available. The latter two capacities were not systematically measured.

RQ3. Provisional configurations of hybrid English home literacy

Cross-participant comparison brought together print centrality, digital integration, maternal mediation, and the distribution of English. Four configurations summarize the organizing emphasis most visible in each account. The first two concern the relative role of print and digital resources; the third concerns the interaction connecting activities; the fourth concerns the spread of English across routines. These emphases operate across related dimensions and can overlap. Table 3 therefore presents illustrative participant alignments, not exclusive household assignments or a classification rule.

Table 3. *Provisional cross-participant configurations of hybrid English home literacy*

Configuration and illustrative accounts	Dominant resources and print-digital connection	Mother's reported role	English practice and routine placement
Print-anchored E Organizing emphasis: print routine	Books anchor shared reading. Digital resources are supplementary; their specific connection to the reading event is not detailed.	Organizes and participates in shared reading.	English is encountered during approximately 30 minutes of bedtime reading each day. This is a bounded event, not a total exposure measure.
Digitally supported F	Songs and YouTube are prominent. Print is less described, and a direct print-	Selects material and sings with the child; interaction during	English is heard and jointly performed through songs. The timing entry reports twice

p-ISSN 2301-7554, e-ISSN 2541-3643
Volume 14, Issue 3, October 2026

Organizing emphasis: digital support	digital connection remains unspecified.	other episodes is not established.	weekly; activity placement beyond this is not specified.
Interaction-centered hybrid B, C, H Organizing emphasis: participation	Repertoires differ: B reports books and YouTube; C objects and environmental print; H co-viewed media and questions. A shared content sequence across media is not established.	B connects reading with conversation; C uses play-based prompts; H asks simple questions and reports co-viewing.	English is practiced around reading, play, choices, and family talk. Timing varies; H's one-hour entry has no stated recurrence. B also shows print centrality.
Distributed hybrid A, D, G Organizing emphasis: routine breadth	Different combinations of books, songs, games, films, and talk occur across accounts. G reports subtitled films; D describes background songs alongside home communication.	Uses English in communication, modeling, or accompaniment. Background provision and interactive talk remain distinct.	English spans several types of activity. A and D describe home communication; G reports two or three weekly occasions. Breadth does not establish continuous exposure.

Note. Participant codes indicate illustrative alignments within eight self-reports. Listed resources are not attributed to every member of a grouped profile. Direct print-digital content transfer was not established for every participant. The configurations are overlapping interpretive profiles, not scored levels, fixed household categories, developmental stages, or effectiveness rankings.

In the print-anchored configuration, E's approximately 30-minute bedtime-reading event gave printed books a stable organizing role. Digital resources were supplementary in her account, but their specific content and connection to that event were not detailed. The defining characteristic is therefore the centrality of a recurring print activity, not an absence of digital media. This profile adds a routine-level interpretation to the traditional/digital distinction in HLE research: a household can use both while one routine supplies its main reported structure (Yuan et al., 2024). The account does not establish that this structure is more beneficial than another.

F illustrates the digitally supported configuration because songs and YouTube were more prominent in the account, including joint singing. Here, digitally supported refers to the support digital resources provide for English activities, not to a demonstrated digital extension of a particular book. Print was less fully described, so this profile has the least explicit evidence of a print-digital connection. Accordingly, this profile documents digital participation more clearly than integration with print. The profile extends a resource-based account by identifying joint performance as one reported use of digital input, while leaving other episodes and their relationship to print unresolved (Liu et al., 2024). It is an organizing emphasis, not a label for predominantly passive screen use.

B, C, and H illustrate the interaction-centered hybrid configuration because conversation, prompts, or questions connected the reported English activities. Their repertoires differed: B emphasized books and YouTube, C described objects and environmental print during play, and H reported co-viewing and conversational questions. The grouping does not imply that each mother used every listed medium or the same mediation strategy. B's estimated 80/20 balance also overlaps with print centrality. The distinctive feature is the role assigned to maternal interaction across activities, not equal media use. This interpretation complements research differentiating shared-reading practices by medium while retaining the heterogeneity within the grouped accounts (Nastasiuk et al., 2024).

A, D, and G illustrate the distributed hybrid configuration because English was reported in several kinds of activity rather than solely around one scheduled event. Their accounts combined home communication with different print or digital resources; D's greetings and background songs and G's communication, games, books, and films make this breadth visible. The label concerns distribution across contexts, not the highest frequency or intensity. G's two or three weekly occasions and A's homework-related timing entry remain relevant qualifications. Compared with language-specific HLE studies, this profile adds a description of routine placement; it does not estimate input quantities or developmental effects (Jiang & Lau, 2025; Jin et al., 2026).

Cross-cutting interpretation and implications

What the configurations add to HLE research

The four configurations are analytically distinct because they answer different organizing questions: what anchors the event, what provides prominent support, how participation connects activities, and where English recurs. They remain compatible with overlap, as B's print-heavy repertoire and interactional emphasis illustrate.

Person-oriented HLE research already identifies combinations of books and activities; for example, Bai et al. (2025) derived latent classes from a large caregiver survey. The present configurations do not replicate those classes or introduce profiling as a new method. Their narrower contribution is a qualitative account of relationships among media, maternal participation, and English routines in this small EFL sample. No statistical classes, population prevalence, or configuration-specific outcomes were estimated.

English within the Indonesian family context

The Indonesian context also changes the interpretation of these relationships. Zein's (2020) account of superglossia emphasizes the context-dependent positions of languages within Indonesia's multilingual ecology. In an EFL home where English is not the habitual family language, a song, storybook, film, or game may delimit a particular opportunity to encounter it. E's bedtime reading illustrates concentration in an event; D's reported greetings and communication illustrate English extending beyond such an event. A's account of English as a main home language cautions against assigning one language pattern to all participants. These are possible arrangements within an EFL setting, not evidence about typical Indonesian households. Full household repertoires were not recorded, so translanguaging, language displacement, and specific allocations among Indonesian, regional languages, and English cannot be established.

Comparison with recent Southeast Asian and Indonesian research locates the contribution more precisely. Malaysian survey evidence associates interactional scaffolding with reported English proficiency, whereas the present study describes the organization of such participation without measuring proficiency (Jin et al., 2026). Indonesian preschool research connects home literacy with early reading (Kusumawardhani et al., 2025), while Bungsudi et al. (2026) identify co-viewing and vocabulary reinforcement in toddlers' YouTube Kids exposure. The reported accompaniment and conversational prompts here accord with that attention to mediation. However, the present questionnaire accounts lack the observations and diaries used in the latter study, so they describe a broader print-digital repertoire with less direct evidence of children's engagement. Their addition is the comparison of resource roles and routine placement, not confirmation of developmental effects. The educationally advantaged urban sample may offer particular opportunities to obtain resources and describe English practices, but education, employment, parental English proficiency, and digital literacy were not compared as explanatory factors. The findings therefore address an underrepresented context without standing for Indonesian mothers generally.

The conceptual contribution is consequently bounded. A resource inventory records what is available or used; a literacy-ecology account specifies the relationships described among resources, mediation, English practice, and routine. This distinction extends the digitally networked view of home literacy into a focused account of early English organization (Flewitt & Clark, 2020). It also makes uneven evidence visible: reported supplementation is weaker evidence of integration than a described interactional connection, and neither demonstrates learning. The four profiles provide a vocabulary for examining those relationships in future research, rather than a universal construct, ranking, or developmental sequence.

Practical implications and limitations

For parents and early-English educators, the accounts offer discussion points about the purpose and placement of existing activities. A family might retain a familiar reading event, sing together when using English songs, or invite simple conversation around a selected video. Extending content from a book into another activity is a possible pedagogical option, not a sequence established for every household in this study. Advice should distinguish selecting material, accompanying use, and participating in talk rather than treating co-viewing as automatically interactive. Research on parental perspectives highlights the demands and child reactions associated with such practices (Mao & Pesco, 2025). More frequent activity, more media, or English across more routines is not prescribed as an improvement; feasibility, other family languages, and children's responses require attention. These suggestions concern the organization of opportunities, not demonstrated gains in English.

Several limitations define the scope of these claims. Eight university-educated, employed mothers in urban settings cannot represent Indonesia's socioeconomic, geographic, linguistic, or caregiving diversity. One mother's account cannot establish the practices of all household members; research on mothers and fathers reinforces the importance of that distinction (Li et

p-ISSN 2301-7554, e-ISSN 2541-3643
Volume 14, Issue 3, October 2026

al., 2024; Liu & Chung, 2025). Written reports may emphasize memorable or socially valued activities. No home observation, diary, device-use record, second caregiver account, or child assessment was available. Timing descriptions use non-equivalent units, and not every print-digital connection is specified. Complete household language repertoires, parental English proficiency, and digital literacy were not systematically assessed. Translation may also affect nuance, although excerpts were cross-checked against original-language responses as described in the Method. Future research should combine diverse caregiver accounts with observations and activity diaries to examine whether the proposed configurations recur, overlap, or change. Independent child measures and appropriate longitudinal or intervention designs would be needed to assess developmental relationships.

CONCLUSION

This study's analytical contribution is to distinguish literacy resources from their reported organization into an English home literacy ecology. In eight urban Indonesian mothers' accounts, books, digital media, maternal participation, and routines acquired meaning through their relationships: a resource could anchor an event, supply complementary input, become part of an exchange, or recur across different activities. The four configurations make these organizing emphases explicit without turning them into fixed household categories.

Print-anchored and digitally supported profiles describe relative resource roles; interaction-centered hybrid and distributed hybrid profiles describe the organizing role of participation and routine placement. These dimensions can overlap. Joint singing, background audio, accompaniment, and questioning also represent different forms of participation, and the presence of several media does not establish direct transfer between them. The ecology perspective is useful precisely because it retains these distinctions and the gaps in what mothers reported.

Empirically, the study adds a bounded account of early English organization in an underrepresented Indonesian EFL context. Conceptually, it relates media and maternal mediation to where English enters family life. Practically, it offers examples for discussing how existing reading, singing, viewing, and conversational activities can be organized within feasible routines. English may be concentrated in selected events or reported more broadly; neither pattern is established as preferable, and the findings do not prescribe replacing other household languages.

The claims are limited to eight university-educated, employed mothers' written self-reports. Household language repertoires, interactional quality, comparable exposure duration, and child outcomes were not assessed. Consequently, neither frequency nor configuration can be interpreted as evidence of better English development. Multisource and longitudinal research could examine the stability of these relationships, while separate child assessments would be necessary to evaluate any developmental effects.

REFERENCES

Adam, P., Kleemans, T., Droop, M., Amorim, A. N., & Segers, E. (2025). A digital boost of the home literacy environment positively impacts early reading and vocabulary development of Indonesian 1st graders at-risk. *The Journal of Educational Research, 118*(5), 425–436. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2025.2490963

Bai, Z., Qi, T., Zhang, Y., Gao, D., Geng, X., Liu, Y., & Liu, L. (2025). Home literacy environment, literacy interest and emergent literacy in China: A person-oriented approach. *Current Psychology, 44*, 6155–6169. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-025-07634-0

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 18*(3), 328–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Conceptual and design thinking for thematic analysis. *Qualitative Psychology, 9*(1), 3–26. https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000196

Brushe, M. E., Haag, D. G., Melhuish, E. C., Reilly, S., & Gregory, T. (2024). Screen time and parent-child talk when children are aged 12 to 36 months. *JAMA Pediatrics, 178*(4), 369–375. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2023.6790

Bungsudi, Hassan, N., & Thresia, F. (2026). Digital input and early language learning: Investigating English as a foreign language exposure in toddlers. *LET: Linguistics, Literature and English Teaching Journal*, 16(1), 28–57. https://doi.org/10.18592/let.v16i1.18790

Cena, E., Brooks, J., Day, W., Goodman, S., Rousaki, A., Ruby-Granger, V., & Seymour-Smith, S. (2024). Quality criteria: General and specific guidelines for qualitative approaches in psychology research. A concise guide for novice researchers and reviewers. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 23*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241282843

El Gemayel, S. M., Flewitt, R., & Goodall, J. (2026). 0–3-year-old children's digital language and literacy practices at home: A scoping review of the literature. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 26*(2), 586–611. https://doi.org/10.1177/14687984251388333

Flewitt, R., & Clark, A. (2020). Porous boundaries: Reconceptualising the home literacy environment as a digitally networked space for 0-3-year-olds. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 20*(3), 447–471. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798420938116

Hall, S., & Liebenberg, L. (2024). Qualitative description as an introductory method to qualitative research for master's-level students and research trainees. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 23*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241242264

Jáñez, A., Rosales, J., De Sixte, R., & Ramos, M. (2024). Is the home literacy environment different depending on the media? Paper vs. tablet-based practices. *Reading and Writing, 37*, 2349–2364. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-023-10467-7

Jiang, Y., & Lau, C. (2025). Home literacy environment and Chinese children's second language development: A cross-lagged analysis. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 72*, 262–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2025.04.004

Jin, Y., Islam, M. M., & Muhammad, M. M. (2026). Multilingual scaffolding at home: Parental practices supporting early English literacy. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 54*(5), 3839–3851. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-026-02148-1

Kim, W.-J., & Yim, D. (2024). Exploring the influence of the home literacy environment on early literacy and vocabulary skills in Korean–English bilingual children. *Frontiers in Psychology, 15*, Article 1336292. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1336292

Kullman, S. M., & Chudyk, A. M. (2025). Participatory member checking: A novel approach for engaging participants in co-creating qualitative findings. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 24*, 16094069251321211. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069251321211

Kusumawardhani, T., Dhieni, N., & Yetti, E. (2025). The effect of home literacy on preschoolers' early reading skills. *PAUDIA: Jurnal Penelitian Dalam Bidang Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, 14*(1), 13–23. https://doi.org/10.26877/paudia.v14i1.1119

Li, H., Lam, S. M., Zhang, X., & Bao, M. (2024). Home literacy environments and Chinese preschool children's literacy trajectories: Examining the unique contributions of fathers versus mothers. *Learning and Individual Differences, 113*, Article 102489. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2024.102489

Liu, C. C., & Chung, K. K. H. (2025). The longitudinal interplay between father–child and mother–child home literacy activities and children's learning English as a second language in Hong Kong. *Journal of Research in Reading, 48*(1), 63–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12476

Liu, S., Reynolds, B. L., Thomas, N., & Soyoof, A. (2024). The use of digital technologies to develop young children's language and literacy skills: A systematic review. *SAGE Open, 14*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241230850

Lloyd, N., Hyett, N., & Kenny, A. (2024). To member check or not to member check? An evaluation of member checking in an interpretive descriptive study. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 23*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241301383

Lu, S., Xu, C., Liu, X., Guo, W., & Xing, X. (2026). The joint effect of screen use and home literacy on children's receptive vocabulary developmental trajectories: A harm reduction perspective. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 74*, 136–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2025.09.004

Mao, W., & Pesco, D. (2025). Chinese mothers' perspectives on supporting young children's language development through dialogic reading and co-viewing. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 34*(3), 724–736. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-025-03013-2

Mathers, S. J., Hodgkiss, A., Kolancali, P., Booton, S. A., Wang, Z., & Murphy, V. A. (2025). Comparing parent-child interaction during wordless book reading, print book reading and imaginative play. *Journal of Child Language, 52*(2), 399–424. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000924000072

Mathers, S. J., Kolancali, P., Jelley, F., Singh, D., Hodgkiss, A., Booton, S. A., Malmberg, L.-E., & Murphy, V. A. (2025). Features of digital media which influence social interactions between adults and children aged 2–7 years during joint media engagement: A multi-level meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 46*, Article 100665. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2025.100665

p-ISSN 2301-7554, e-ISSN 2541-3643
Volume 14, Issue 3, October 2026

Nag, S., Vagh, S. B., Dulay, K. M., Snowling, M., Donolato, E., & Melby-Lervåg, M. (2024). Home learning environments and children's language and literacy skills: A meta-analytic review of studies conducted in low- and middle-income countries. *Psychological Bulletin, 150*(2), 132–153. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000417

Nastasiuk, A., Courteau, É., Thomson, J., & Deacon, S. H. (2024). Drawing attention to print or meaning: How parents read with their preschool-aged children on paper and on screens. *Journal of Research in Reading, 47*(3), 412–428. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12451

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60–93. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.66.1.17370n67v22j160u

Nicholas, M., & Paatsch, L. (2024). The shared reading of digital storybooks with young children: Parents' perspectives. *Research Papers in Education, 39*(4), 650–667. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2023.2205411

Sénéchal, M., & LeFevre, J.-A. (2002). Parental involvement in the development of children's reading skill: A five-year longitudinal study. *Child Development, 73*(2), 445–460. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00417

Soyoof, A., Reynolds, B. L., Neumann, M., Scull, J., Tour, E., & McLay, K. (2024). The impact of parent mediation on young children's home digital literacy practices and learning: A narrative review. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 40*(1), 65–88. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12866

Sundqvist, A., Majerle, N., Heimann, M., & Koch, F.-S. (2024). Home literacy environment, digital media and vocabulary development in preschool children. *Journal of Early Childhood Research, 22*(4), 570–583. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X241257337

Taylor, G., Sala, G., Kolak, J., Gerhardstein, P., & Lingwood, J. (2024). Does adult-child co-use during digital media use improve children's learning aged 0–6 years? A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 44*, Article 100614. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2024.100614

Thomas, S. L., Pitt, H., McCarthy, S., Arnot, G., & Hennessy, M. (2024). Methodological and practical guidance for designing and conducting online qualitative surveys in public health. *Health Promotion International, 39*(3), Article daae061. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daae061

Yuan, H., Kleemans, T., & Segers, E. (2024). The role of the traditional and digital home literacy environment in Chinese kindergartners' language and early literacy. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 67*, 67–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2023.11.009

Zein, S. (2020). *Language policy in superdiverse Indonesia*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429019739

Zhang, X., & Lau, C. (2026). Interest, home environment, and young Chinese children's development of English as a second/foreign language. *Journal of Child Language, 53*(1), 38–61. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000924000618