CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Among the members of society, we can find many social phenomena. I find that one's language has a relationship with the environment where the person lives. This study is specifically concerned with the language of children and the environment of language socialization within the family. Since it deals with language and the social aspect, it is pertinent to examine them from the linguistics and social science point of view, especially socialization aspect. This chapter will present a discussion concerning the theoretical framework underlying the studies and the related studies which deal with this problem.

II.1. Related theories

Every human being cannot live alone without friends, he needs an environment where he may grow up and develop. Social environment is very crucial for every man since in it he can communicate with others.

Social environment can be divided into many social institutions, the smallest one is the family. It is the initial institution or group known by the newborns. In family, the development of the newborns begin to be shaped; they experience the first contact with others.

10

As an institution in society, family engages upon some tasks as William J. Goode (1977:369) pointed out :

- Reproduction of the young
- Physical maintenance of family members
- Social placement of children and adult
- Socialization and emotional support
- Social control

According to Jerome Kagan (1978:33-34) family has some functions which can be seen from the state's perspective, the parents's perspective, and the child's perspective.

The state's perspective state that family is the preferable unit for nurturing and socializing the child because they assume that most families try to do the best for their children and this will give a profit to the state for it is more economical for the state if the family has this responsibility.

From the perspective of the parents, Kagan said that family offers a different set of resources. It is a space where any kind of emotion such as anger, despair, depression are allowed to be expressed more freely than outside the walls of the home. Family provides an opportunity for adults (wife-husband) to feel needed and useful. When the adults become parents, each of them has a chance to promote a hard-won set of ethics and to test the utility of standards that took many years to create. In a sense, each parent is a scientist testing a personal theory of human develop-

ment with a child.

The child's perspective sets out that the family participates directly in three basic processes, i.e. family as a model for identification, as a source of protection and attachment and it disseminates information regarding he profile of actions, appearance, thought that the child must command if he is to attain a sense of virtue and competence.

Children make their parents as examples of everything they need to learn. In family, children get protection, attachment, affection from parents. Dealing with the communication of information to the child, Kagan (1978:38) said that :

> it is not doubted that parental practices and attitudes, whether viewd as rewards and punishments or simply as communications, influence the child's development. Therefore, we need to determine the relation between what the family members do and say, on the one hand, and the child's representations of what they do and say, on the other.

In short, family is a significant unit in preparing the young to enter the society.

When we talk about family, parents cannot be apart from it since parents play a great role in educating their children. Childhood experience is very meaningful since at such time the basic patterns to satisfy emotional and psychological need give influences to a child.

Each family has its own way in educating its members, in other words, there are *types of family* in society. Types of family may be viewed from the point of view of patterns of socialization.

Socialization process occurs to every individuals because from the time he was born has been engaged within a group called family. What makes difference is 'what' is being internalised as consequences of socialization. This distinction may be manifested in attitudes.

Agents of socialization can be family, school, peer group, and place of work. But in this study it only deals with the family because most of the process of learning and developing happens in it.

Socialization is not only obtained from identification of child to parents, but it depends on the kind of interaction between parents and child. This type of interaction, according to Herbert Gans, can be devided into :

1. *Adult-Centered*. It is a type in which parents do not give direction or advice about how children must act and behave, what the child should achieve in future in society. The child gets full freedom to determine all of his action, and decides what they want to do. Parents only care with their own need without paying attention to the child's wishes.

2. *Children-Centered*. It is a type in which parents always concern on close relationships with the children. What the children are going to do is always considered by the parents and children.

3. *Adult-Directed*. In this type, parents obligate the children to obey all rules that have been made by parents. For them, children have to submit themselves to the parents, have to get control and pressure from the parents.

As it has been mentioned before that patterns of socialization is a reflection of type of family. It is necessary to know this because, commonly, type of family gives so much influence to its members in many aspects of life. From father and mother, children attain all basic ability, either intelectual or social. the kinds of model or patterns of socialization from which we can determine the type of family are :

1. *Authoritarian*. A model which use punishment and discipline to the children. The children do not have a chance to reveal their emotion and to present their opinion. Parents use their position to show their authority

2. *Democratic*. Parents provide time and chance for the children to express their emotion and opinion. Whatever the children want to do, it is always consider and being talked to the parents to get advice and agreement from them. The parents know when they should apply their authority, when the children should be punished, when should be given advice and show affectional action to children.

3. *Unconventional*. There is no boundaries here. Parents give full freedom for children to do what they want so children always get agreements without asking

permition from parents to do everything.

Ideally, the best and the effective model of socialization is the democratic one. It is so because there is a two-sided communication between parents and children, so each member of the family recognizes and knows very well the condition of each. Goode (1977:88) point out:

> Here are some factors that have been reported to be especially important in effective socialization :
>
> 1. Warmth, nurturance, and affection from parents or other persons (teachers, peers) who trying to socialize the child.
>
> 2. Identification of the child with the parents or socializer.
>
> 3. Authority of parents.
>
> 4. Consistency.
>
> 5. Giving freedom to the children.
>
> 6. Explanation and reasons.
>
> 7. Punishment.

The warm parents are more likely to be attentive to the needs of the children and can more effectively arouse guilt or concern in the child by the withdrawal of love, while the hostile parents cannot use that potent weapon as easily. For effective socialization only a modest amount of nurturance or love is necessary. The effect of a warm relationship between parents and child is especially apparent when the father or the mother uses the withdrawal of love as a mode of socializing the child.

What parents do to the children motivate them to identify with the parents. Through the process of identification, the role of parents are taken by children.

Authority will have strong effect when combined with warmth and affection. Authority here must not be confused with willingness to use force. Punishment is not an expression of personal anger or hostility. Rather, the parents is simply carrying out the rules of ethics, religion, morality, or justice. This is most effective when parents themselves obey those rules.

The effect of authority is greater if the discipline by parents and other socializing agents is consistent, that is, if punishment and rewards are usually forthcoming in accordance with the rules of the family group.

Giving freedom to children can increase the child's inner commitment. It does not mean that parents give full freedom but it is given in accordance to the situation and condition.

All of the factors mentioned above are reinforced by communication, by explanations , and reasons that parents may give to the child. Both adults and children are more likely to accept rules as their own if others explain why the rules should be followed or obeyed.

Punishment has many effects on the socialization of children. It has very strong. lasting, crude, and

negative effects. Punishment does not inform what is right to the children. Everyday we can learn many wrong things without ever knowing and learning what is right.

Punishment also has greater impact if it is combined with explanations and reasons. But generally, punishment give bad consequences to the children.

Type of family, which is reflected by the way the parents socialize their children, brings many influences to the socializee. The result of socialization can be manifested in behaviour, speech, world-view, attitude, language and life-style of people.

Bernstein considered that the way in which language used at home in the different type of family cause different impact on the members of the family (Wallwork, 1978:42). It is because language is always related to the environment where people' live. In life people do use language to face the reality. Wallwork clarifies this relationship between language and reality and he states that it is easiest to do that when looking at the language of a young child, for both his language and his life are relatively uncluttered and simple (Wallwork, 1978:15).

The child maybe brought up at home which is based primarily on the virtues of mechanical solidarity ('Do as I say!') or in one more inclined to teach him the virtues of organic solidarity ('Think it out'). By and large, most people bring up their children on the

basis of the way they themselves were brought up. Bernstein make a different, and probably more important distinction between family systems, which he called the *positional and person-oriented families.* Families of the positional type would customarily base their lives on the concepts of mechanical, person-oriented families on organic solidarity. He tought that the way language was used for certain functions inherent in the process of bringing up children within families would be different for these different family types. In looking at such language uses within the family, Halliday's seven models was taken over.

Bernstein considered that the way in which language was used in the socialization context would differ from one type to another. In the positional type of family, language would be relatively dependent on other factors such as physical contact, shared assumptions, and would have a larger proportion of implicit rather than explicit meanings; in the person-oriented families, language used would be more independent of these other factors, would be explicit and understandable without reference to the immediate context.

The terms which are used by Bernstein are 'elaborated code' and 'restricted code'. Another important terms are 'universalistic meanings' and 'particularistic meaning'. The last two terms are expressed through context-bound and context-free

language when the speakers expressed their ideas. He argued that forms of socialization orient the child towards speech codes which control access to relatively context-tied or relatively context-free. Bernstein suggested that restricted codes have their basis on condensed symbols whereas elaborated codes have their basis in articulated symbols (see further p.54). That restricted codes draw upon metaphor whereas elaborated codes draw upon rationality (see further p.52).

Halliday in an article entitled 'Relevant Models of Language' reported his attempts to ascertain by observation the relationship between a child's life and his language. Halliday suggested that children have seven models of language, i.e : (Wallwork, 1978:15-16)

1. **Instrumental.** Children learn that language is a way of getting things done.

2. **Regulatory.** This model of language is one which plays a very important role in socialization. Children experience the fact that people use language to control them. The language in which this regulatory function is learnt, may have very profound effects on their life.

3. **Interactional.** It has an important role in the life of a young child, since it is used to interact with others-adults, peers, parents.

4. **Personal.** It is used when we talk to ourselves.

5. **Heuristics.** It is a language that is used to express opinion. It is developed by the extent to which it provides him with satisfaction or not.

6. **Imagination.** It is poetic language.

7. **Representational.** It seems this model is important for adults, but not for children. It is to pass on information.

The development of children's life go hand in hand with the development of their language. The relation of developing of language and developing of life is too entangled to be separated.

Further more, Halliday stated that with the greater complexity of function in an utterance may well go a restriction, or at least a change, in the perception of available uses as the child becomes an adult. Such restriction or change is likely to be the result of the social and linguistic environment in which the child finds himself (Wallwork, 1978:18). A well educated 'intelectual' may throughout his life still find uses for the 'heuristic' model of language, but it is certain that many adults use it only in restricted ways, as when it may be necessary to ask for practical directions or for essential information. They may well cease to ask question (as a child) purely to satisfy a desire for knowledge that is not seen to be immediately necessary or relevant, perhaps because the asking of such questions has been unrewarding from early childhood. The child may have had too much experience of replies like : 'Stop asking questions and get on with it!' or "Life's too short to worry about the whys and wherefores'. If such discouragement to questioning has been predominant, a child may cease to value this function, and may, even by the age of going to school,

have ceased to exercise it to any extent. Similarly the imaginative and personal models of any individual. There are, too, differences in the culture of different peoples which reflect differential esteem for different function of language and any individual's perception of language use will be coloured by the perceptions of the people amongst whom he is brought up. Thus the child's, and later the adult's perception of language will, it can be argued, affect perception of what 'real life' is and of the way in which a person can lead his life.

Language as a tool of expressing ideas, can be manifested into spoken or written form. Written form may be narrative, descriptive and so on. Dealing with narrative form, Labov pointed out that a fully developed natural narrative is made up of the following section : *abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, result 'or resolution, and coda.*

The *abstract* is a short summary of the story that narrators generally provide before recounting the story proper.

The *orientation* serve to identify in some way the time, place, person and their activity or situation and occurs immediately before the first narrative clause, as' a rule.

Evaluation is the means used by the narrator to indicate the point of the narrative : why it was told and what the narrator was getting at the elaborates.

Coda is to close off the sequence of complicating actions and indicate that none of the events that followed were important to the narrative.

Keith T. Kernan (Kernan, 1977:99) who learnt about children's discourse, in his work **Semantic and Expressive Elaboration in Children's Narratives** stated that 10-14 children seem to be more interested in elaborating the background information necessary to a proper inter-pretation and understanding of narrative than the younger children. The younger (under 10 years old) the child, the more likely the narrative will be that the understanding and appreciation of the narrative by the audience will be based upon the narrative events themselves. The older the child, the more likely it will be that a proper understanding and appreciation of the narrative will be assured through the use of contextual and extranarrative elaboration. The young children seem to aasume that the communication of the events themselves will result in the same understanding and appreciation on the part of the audience that they themselves have. The older children, on the other hand, realize that the interpretation and appreiation of the narrative events will depend, at least in part, upon knowledge that is external to the narrative events themselves.

II.2. Related Studies of other thesis about this work

There are two works that have ever concerned with this work such as Bernstein and Henderson. Follows, I will discuss their work respectively.

II.2.1. Bernstein's work

His work was about **Social Class, Language, and Socialization.** He concerned with the problem of the relationships between symbolic order and social structure in his thesis, as he said :

> The general sociolinguistics thesis attempts to explore how symbolic systems are both realization and regulators of the strusture of social relationships. The particular symbolic system is that of speech not language. (Bernstein, 1977:158)

As he was a sociologist, Bernstein started out from the starting point of social sciences. In other words, it can be said that his thesis was an integration of different stream of thought. His major starting point were Durkheim and Marx, and supported by a small number of other thinkers.

According to Bernstein, Durkheim, in his "Primitive Classification" and in "The Elementary Forms of The Religious Life", attempted to get the basic categories of thought from the structuring of the social relation. Bernstein (1972:159) stated that :

> Durkheim raised the whole question of the relation between the classifications and frames of the symbolic order and the structuring of experience. In his study if different forms of social integration he pointed to the implicit, condensed, symbolic structure of mechanical solidarity and the more explicit and differentiaed symbolic structures of

organic solidarity.

Bernstein was also influenced by Sapir and Whorf that alerted him to the selectively effect of the culture upon the patterning of grammar, patterns of semantics and the important of cognition.

Of the works above, Bernstein found two difficulties. Firstly, how symbolic system and social structure shaped experience; secondly, concerning the problem of change of symbolic system. To solve these, he took Mead's and Marx's thought.

Bernstein consideres the relationship between language and socialization. He emphasized that he dealt with speech not language, more particularly with the contextual constraint on speech. Further. about socialization, he pointed out :

> Socialization refers to the process whereby the biological is transformed into a specific cultural being....
> Socialization sensitizes the child to various orderings of society as these are made sub-tantive in the various roles he is expected to play... (Bernstein, ibid:162).

We all know that the main or basic agencies of socialization in our society are family, school, peers group, and work place. But Bernstein limited his discussion only to socialization in family. From this matter, he raised a problem : What are sociological factors which affect linguistics performances within the family critical to the process of socialization ?

He compared two classes - working class and middle class. Distinction of social class influences

the work, educational roles and the next made a special relationship among members within family. In short we can say that different social class brings to different nature of type of family. Here, there are two kinds of family type which are called *positional family* and *person-centered family*. Bernstein wanted to know how these types of family socializee the children and how the socialization affects the speech of the children.

He based his clasification of family type on the boundaries maintaining procedures that exist in family. Boundaries maintaining procedures here mean the norm which exist that arrange the life of family. Two kinds of boundaries are mentioned in Bernstein' work - strong and weak boundaries.

Strong boundaries are when the differentiation of members' position are clear-cut. It is in accordance with the age, sex, and age-relation status. The position intended here are the position of the parents and the children. The concrete example of what is meant by clear cut is : 'I am your father, you are my son, so listen to me and obey what I say'. If family has this kind of boundaries, it is called positional family.

Person-centered family has weak boundaries, whereby the status and the position within family are not distinguished. It means that the parents treat their children as persons.

He suggested that those type of family give

different results on children'speech. The speech of children with background of positional family will be restricted while those from person-centered will be elaborated.

Elaborated speech means that the speech is context-tied, refers to universalistic meaning. On the other hand, restricted speech refers to particularistic meaning. This is explained further in the chapter IV of this thesis.

In conclusion, Bernstein wanted to clarify how the class system acts upon the deep structure of communication in the process of socialization.

II.2.2. HENDERSON'S WORK.

He is a Sociologist who joins The Sociological Research Unit of The Department of Sociology, University of London Institute of Education which investigated and concerned with the study of variations between and within social class on familial patterns of communication and control. The emphasis is on the contextual usage of language in socializing children.

Henderson compared the mothers who come from two different classes whose children were seven years old. He took 120 mothers who live among Middle Class and 192 who live among Working Class in London. The social class here, which was constructed by Walter Brandis of the Sociological Research Unit,were based on the terminal education and occupation of husband and wife.

The hypotheses or the expected findings of Henderson's are : (Henderson, 1982;315)

1. Both Middle Class (MC) and Working Class (WC) mothers would place greater emphasis upon the use of language in interpersonal aspects of socializaton than the emphasis placed upon language in the socialization into basic skills.

2. The shift in emphasis in the use of language from the skill to the person area would be much greater in the MC group.

3. Within the skills area the MC group would place a greater emphasis upon language in the transmission of principles.

4. MC mothers would be more likely than WC mothers to take up the child's attempts to initiate verbal interaction.

5. There would be social class differences in the frequency with which questions were avoided or evaded. MC mothers would avoid answering less frequently than WC mothers.

6. There would be differences in response between types of questions. Some questions would elicit greater avoidance than others.

7. MC mothers would choose general defini-tions when explaining things to children

more frequently than WC mothers.

8. MC mothers would choose exact, explicit concrete examples more frequently than WC mothers.

9. WC mothers would be more likely to choose concrete examples than MC mothers.

In collecting the data, Henderson used 4 schedules . These schedules aim to know how mothers use language to children and to examine three aspects of the mothers' patterns of verbal communication with their seven-year-old children. Each schedule has its own characteristics and are applied for special aim.

Schedule A consists of 11 questions to know on which mothers emphasize the use of language in socialization of pre-school children, whether on inter-rela tionship or on the acquisition of basic skills. Inter-relationship here means that mothers try to communicate interpersonally with children. Whereas the acquisition of basic skills refers to how mothers teach their children, for instance about the function of spoon and fork.

Henderson summarizes his results from schedule A as follows :

- MC mothers emphasize more on the use of language into interpersonal and intrapersonal relationship in socialization of children, while WC mothers emphasize on the basic skills.

- MC mothers emphasize on the use of language in

transmission of principles. MC mothers find it necessary to explicate the principle verbally.

Commonly, children have high curiosity, therefore they like to ask quite a lot to their parents. Schedule B is used to obtain data about how mothers response to their children who attempt to chat to her.

He provides seven situations offered to mothers of MC and WC and ask them to say what they do if children chatter or ask in those situations. Whether they will "Tell him to stop", "Tell him to wait", "Answer him quickly", "Chat to him", to these kinds of situations.

The result of the analysis of schedule B shows that MC mothers more likely to respond by chatting to the child. Even though, the most frequent avoided answer is "Tell him to stop".

In schedule C, they were presented eight questions which a child was likely to ask, and the mothers are asked to choose their initial responses to each questions from six answers that have been provided. Four of the question indicate avoidance while the other two - 'Take the opportunity to discuss the matter with him' and "Give him a brief answer and see if he's satisfied'- indicate positive responses.

The analysis reveals that WC mothers avoid answering questions more often than MC mothers, while

MC mothers more likely to discuss the matter with the children.

To find out how mothers explain the meaning of words to their children, the schedule D is used. Mothers are asked to choose two of four possible types of answers for each of the words - 'cool', 'mix', 'dangerous', and 'flexible'. The choices have to be ranked in terms of the first statement the mother would be most likely to choose and then the statement which she thought second best.

The four statement offered for each word were presented in the form of (a) general definition, (b) an antonym, (c) a highly specific concrete example, and (d) a much less specific concrete example.

MC mothers are more likely than WC mothers to choose a general definition first in answer to two of the words 'dangerous' and 'flexible'. WC mothers are more likely to choose the least specific concrete example first in response to two of the words, 'mix' and 'dangerous'.

From the explanation above, Henderson has shown that MC mothers rather than WC mothers :

1. Favour abstract definition than defining principle.

2. Favour explicit rather than implicit 'concrete' definitions.

3. Favour information giving strategies in answer to children's questions. They avoid answering questions much less.

4. Favour emphasizing language in the trans
   mision of moral principles and in the
   recognition of feeling.

5. Favour emphasizing language in the trans
   mission of principles as these relate to
   objects ('Showing him how things work).

6. Favour talking frequently to unspecified
   other adults in the cognitive area. This
   leads us to assume that MC mothers'
   cognitive world, relative to the WC
   mothers' cognitive world, is expanding,
   and the *consequences feed back to her
   child*.

In conclusion, MC children rather than WC chil-

dren has a greater range of educationally relevant

knowledge and are oriented through language to princi-

ples as these relate to objects and persons.

By the results of his investigation, Henderson

reveals that sub-cultures, or indeed, cultures, place a

differential emphasis upon *language* in the context of

socialization.

II.3. The Approaches used in this thesis

Sociolinguistics approach is used in this thesis

since it concerning language and social aspects.

The research in this thesis constitutes an

extension of the study carried out by Bernstein.

Therefore the same instrument is used for data

collection, i.e. •a set of pictures to obtain the

picture of the language used by the children.

However, this thesis starts from the observing

the writing of the students, and see how certain

different meaning is realized in their writing. From

32

the result of this writing, the writer tries to relate
it to the type of language socialization used at home
and see whether the two are related. This is presented
in chapter IV (Data Analysis).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY