

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of The Study

Language development in children has been started since their very early ages. As time goes, there are several stages that children have to go through to accomplish the process of language acquisition. In the second year of their age, which is regarded as the very early stage of language development, the children are believed to have mastered a minimum of 50 words from a variety of classes of words and learning about 2-4 new words every day (Hamida, 2009). Children naturally will know that language is the way to communicate to people around them. Children can get information about language and its word from people around them because most mothers interact with their children much more than other family members.

Every new word that children acquire mostly from the mother. In this discussion, the writer will look deeply about the role of mother and how she teaches new words, especially when there are conversations between mothers and children in natural situation and from mother's natural speech.

Having a conversation with children, adults especially mother often gives information or input about the way they use the language in various aims at various conditions as well (Hamida, 2009). When mothers taught the children

about the object's name, they have their own strategies. Callanan (1985) in Hamida (2009) found that parents mostly use basic category in labeling objects. This was considered as the simple way because teaching the basic category of one object can ease the children to understand the name of the object. But when they have to teach about superordinate category of the object, they used both basic and superordinate category by adding some information about why two labels are being applied to the same object. The additional information of the connection between basic and superordinate category gives the children information why two labels are being applied to the same object.

The very latest research which was conducted by Callanan dan Sabbagh (2004: 748) found that in verbal interaction with children, parents prefer to use the pattern of one label for one object instead of using the pattern of multi labels for one object. It was believed that parents use this pattern to simplify their utterances in order to make their children easy in understanding the utterances especially for those children who learn the language in a very early period. It also aimed at helping them infer systematically about the appropriate name for each object which is commonly used and has conventional characteristic. Something that makes a word become a conventional word is that each person of a community of the language agrees that one name relates to certain object. But the conventionality is different from one language to another language because the relation of word and its meaning is arbitrary (Hamida, 2009)

Callanan & Sabbagh (2004) on their research found that there are three patterns in teaching objects' name to children. First is the pattern of one label for

one object. This pattern uses one label that pointed to one kind of object. For example, “this is table”. Second is multilabels with *bridging* for one object. *Bridging* is the information that explains the connection between the names. The pattern of multilabels for one object with *bridging* uses more than one label for one object, but there is information that explained the connection between those labels and the pointed object. The example: *Parent*: “Do you know what kind of a **whale** this is? It’s a Special kind of **whale** that you like.” *Child*: “Shark!” (Callanan & Sabbagh, 2004). And the third is the pattern of multilabels for one object without *bridging*. The pattern of multilabels without *bridging* uses more than one label for one object, but there is none of information that explained the connection between those labels and the pointed object. And the example is, *Parent*: it’s a killer **whale**. It’s an **orca**.

Furthermore, Callanan & Sabbagh (2004) stated that parents prefer to use one label for one object instead of use multi labels when they teach the name of the objects. For example, “this is car. And that is called bus.” This kind of pattern eases the children to understand about the conventionality of object’s name. Keep in our mind that the conventionality of object’s name is important for children who learn to acquire new words in a very early period. Meanwhile, there is another strategy in teaching object’s name, that is multilabels for one object. For example, parent: “**Pants**. What color are the baby’s **shorts**?”(Callanan & Sabbagh, 2004). Callanan and Sabbagh deem that this kind of strategy will not ease the children to understand about the conventionality concept of the object’s name except the parents add *bridging*, which is additional information that

directly or indirectly will explain clearly about the correlation between the two names of objects that already explained. On the other research from Callanan (1989) found that the strategy by using multi label for one object was effectively worth for children over 4 year old.

Callanan & Sabbagh on their research found that parents tend to use one label for one object. Meanwhile, in Indonesia, Hamida (2009) found different. Fact on her research, she tried to see the patterns of labeling object that mostly used by parents in Indonesia when interacting with children of 2-3 years old. She found that Indonesian mothers who come from middle-high social class prefer to use the patter of multilabels with *bridging* for one object. This is quite different from the previous research that was conducted by Callanan & Sabbagh (2004) who used Western parents as subject of the research. On her interpretation Hamida (2009) stated that the diversity of the pattern which is chosen by Indonesian parents and Western parents during the acquisition process is because of the different culture.

It is interesting because for the moment, the cause of this difference is because of the different culture. Based on the research of Callanan & Sabbagh (2004) and Hamida (2009) the writer wants to know more about this phenomenon. This interest appears because in the writer's opinion parents in Indonesia come from different of economic, social, and educational background. Because the previous research which conducted by Hamida (2009) used mothers who come from middle-high social class which might also well educated, it would be interesting to find more about this by considering the diversities of Indonesian

parent. The writer is interested in finding another possibility that might occur when the process of acquisition happened if the writer chooses mothers from low economic status as a subject of the research. The writer assumes that mothers from low economic background with lower education may give input more uninformative. It means mothers from low economic background will use the pattern of multilabels without *bridging* more than the pattern of one label for one object or the pattern of multilabels with *bridging* for one object.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Does the pattern of one label for one object, multilabels with *bridging* for one object, or multilabels without *bridging* for one object mostly used by mothers of low economic status in teaching object's name during verbal interaction with 2-3 year old children?

1.3. Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this research is based on the statement of the problem and it is a comparative hypothesis. There are three parts of hypothesis, because statement of the problem could not be answered by only one time hypothesis. The following are the hypotheses:

- (i) H₀ : There is no difference in the frequency of occurrence between the pattern of one label for one object and the pattern of multilabels with

bridging for one object in mothers' utterances during verbal interaction with 2-3 years old children.

H1 : There is a difference in the frequency of occurrence between the pattern of one label for one object and the pattern of multilabels with *bridging* for one object in mothers' utterances during verbal interaction with 2-3 years old children.

(ii) H0 : There is no difference in the frequency of occurrence between the pattern of multilabels with *bridging* and the pattern of multilabels without *bridging* in mothers' utterances during verbal interaction with 2-3 years old children.

H1 : There is a difference in the frequency of occurrence between the pattern of multilabels with *bridging* and the pattern of multilabels without *bridging* in mothers' utterances during verbal interaction with 2-3 years old children.

(iii) H0 : There is no difference in the frequency of occurrence between the pattern of one label for one object and the pattern of multilabels without *bridging* for one object in mothers' utterances during verbal interaction with 2-3 years old children.

H1 : There is a difference in the frequency of occurrence between the pattern of one label for one object and the pattern of multilabels with *bridging* for one object in mothers' utterances during verbal interaction with 2-3 years old children.

1.4. Research Variables

Based on the hypothesis, the variable in this research are:

- **Independent Variable**

The independent variable in this research is the patterns that occurred from mothers' utterances in labeling/naming objects, whether they use one label or multilabels. Because the pattern that will occur might be more than one, this free variable will be divided into three parts; one label for one object (X1), multilabels with *bridging* for one object (X2), and multilabels without bridging for one object (X3). Free variable is necessary because it is estimated influence children's understanding about conventionality (Hamida, 2009).

- **Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable in this research is children' understanding about the conventionality names of the object. This variable is used as dependent variable because it is assumed to be influenced by the pattern that mostly occurred in mothers' utterances in labeling objects' name.

1.5. Objective of the Study

The objective of the study is to discover the language input given by mothers of low economic status in teaching objects' name to their children of 2-3 year old.

1.6. Significance of the Study

The writer has very big expectation to this research in giving new understanding about the language input and the process of giving the input to children. Children on their period of learning many things especially in word learning are important to have all good and appropriate information as much as possible.

1.7. Definition of Key Terms

1. Input = Information in mother or other adult utterances that can help children understand about the use of language (Hamida, 2009).
2. One label for one object = The pattern in teaching object's name using one label that point to one object (Callanan & Sabbagh, 2004)
3. Multilabels with Bridging = The pattern in teaching object's name using more than one label with additional information about the object which is called as bridging (Callanan & Sabbagh,

2004).

4. Multilabels without bridging = The pattern in teaching object's name using more than one label without additional information about the object (Callanan & Sabbagh, 2004).
5. Bridging = Information about the relation between the names that stated by mothers or others when they used the pattern of multilabels for one object (Callanan & Sabbagh, 2004).
6. Disambiguation Task = This is the situation that children accept only one name for one category of the object. For example; children have known about the word 'dog' as the name of the animal, they will not accept that 'bulldog' or 'cihuahua' is also kind of dog.