

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

The order of presentation in this chapter is as follows : (1) A general description of the object of the study is presented in IV.1 ; (2) then in IV.2, an analysis of the children's language is presented; (3) Part IV.3 will present the analysis of the types of family, which shows the patterns of language socialization in the homes; (4) Part IV.4. present the relationship between the children's language and the types of family.

IV.1. Description of the object of the study.

Firstly, I need to present the description of the objects of my study. It is important on the hope that we know the condition of the objects.

SD GIKI I is one of the private schools that exist in Surabaya. It has only one class for each grade. The sixth grade consists of 30 students, 12 girls and 18 boys. Their age ranges from 10-13 years old. Of the 30 students that are given the pictures, 2 of them do not give them back. So the total sample of this study are 28 students.

The respondents, most of them, belong to a small family. The family, on the average, only has 2-3 children. The parents get good enough occupation such

as doctor, civil servants and entrepreneur. The parents are 33- 53 of age. The kind of family will be explained and analysed further in part IV.3 of this chapter.

IV.2. Presentation and Analysis of Data.

Since there are two kinds of variables in this study, I will present them one by one clearly.

IV.2.1. The Children's Language.

It has been mentioned before that the main respondents of this study are the children of the sixth grade of Elementary school who are asked to make a narrative based on the picture given to them. The investigator does not give any particular conditions concerning the narratives, for instances they must write a pieceful of paper or they must mention a name, place, and time or other conditions. So, the narratives depend on their own ideas and creativities.

Most of them try to write longer than the others. A number of the children attempt to fulfill the paper provided for them, only a few students express their ideas in short. On the average, their narratives contain of 6-50 clauses. It happens, perhaps, because the data are taken at school, so that the students try to do their best in order to get good marks from the teacher, although the investigator does not force them to make a good composition.

In general, the children organize their

composition in accordance with the number of the pictures. Since there are four series of pictures, the children arrange 4 paragraphs in their stories. But it does not mean that each paragraph must tell the pictures accordingly. This means that when the first picture shows some boys playing football; the children might not write about this, but about other matters which refer or relate to such information or situation.

The aim of analysing the children's language is to know whether their languages are elaborated or restricted. The criteria of elaborated speech are : generate universalistic meaning, context-independent, draw upon rationality, and using articulated symbols. Conversely, they are classified into restricted speech when their narratives generate particularistic meaning, context-tied, draw upon metaphoric and have their basis in condensed symbols. They will be analysed in the following discussion.

Before we go further, let us see about the structure of the narratives to know if the narratives generate universalistic or particularistic meaning. To analyse this, Labov's paradigm structure for narrative is used but not to look all of the components. It is not intended to examine in details the syntactic realization of this structure but to regard the way the children express /elaborate their ideas. The structure of narrative in order, as outlined by Labov,

are as follows :

1. Abstract
2. Orientation
3. Complicating action
4. Evaluation
5. Resolution

Abstracts are clauses at the beginning of the narrative that summarize the entire story or the result of the story. None of the children under the study use these abstracts. If there are summaries or the result of the story, they are not placed at the beginning but at the end of the story or as resolution. Almost all of the children begin their story with the sentences :

1. "Pada suatu hari Anton mengajak temannya bermain bola."
2. "Pada suatu siang sehabis pulang sekolah..."
3. "Pada pagi hari, Iwan, Budi, dan Yanto bermain bola..."
4. "Pada hari Minggu...."
5. "Pada hari libur...."

The children mention certain time to start their stories, such as one day, on one Sunday, in the morning, in the afternoon after school, etc. The result of the story or the summary is commonly placed at the end of the entire story. So, in general, children are not accustomed to use abstract in their telling.

Orientations are clauses that provide some information as to time, place, characters, names and their activity or situation. In addition, orientation provides information that is necessary for understanding the narratives. Most of the children feel it necessary to give some sort of background

information before they enter the actual point.

In orientation, children elaborate time, place and characters, likely by mentioning names though the listeners or the readers may not be familiar with those characters. To elaborate time the children prefer to use : *pada suatu hari, pada hari sabtu, pada hari libur, pada hari Minggu*. Of the 28 children, only 3 persons that do not elaborate time. Even though the children do not state date, they attempt to interpret the picture that the event described there occurs in a certain time so that the readers can imagine it.

The clauses such as :

1. "Di depan rumah Pak Broto"
2. "Di halaman depan rumah Pak Sukri"
3. "Di depan rumah orang lain"

are used to tell the readers about the place. Here, the children can interpret the picture well - since at last the ball breaks the window so they tell that the boys are playing in front of someone's house. That is why the children frequently state those statements to show the place.

Characters are commonly given to explain who are playing football. There are significant differences in this case, the children who identify the characters only by giving names and those who identify the characters by naming them plus characteristics. The characters in the story are the boys who are playing football and the man, the owner of the house. About

14.29 % of the total sample identify the characters by giving names and their characteristics, for instances :

1. "Ada tiga anak yang bernama *Anton, Rizki, dan Budi* mereka *sangat nakal* mereka semua *laki-laki* dan mereka *tidak pernah membantu orang tua mereka* mereka *suka membohongi orang-orang.*"
2. "...*pertama-tama* yang memulai permainan adalah si anak *nakal, yaitu Badu,...*"
3. "... karena mereka *lebih tua* dan *berbadan lebih besar* daripada aku dan..."
4. "Pak *Ali* orangnya *sangat jahat dan kejam.*"
5. "... bersama-sama di lapangan dekat rumah Pak *Karyo* yang *galak.*"
6. "... orang yang punya rumah itu... dan dia adalah Pak *Daman* yang terkenal *jahat* di desanya.

Ordinarily, the characteristics explained are about the nature such as naughty, older, liar, wicked man, and relatively rare about the physical appearance as tall, fat, and so on.

The rest of 82,14 % of the children do not elaborate characteristics, but giving characters only, as follows :

1. " Ada *tiga anak* bermain bola."
2. " ... di depan rumah *orang lain.*"
3. " ... *beberapa anak kampung* yang sedang bermain sepak bola.

or just naming the characters :

1. "Dodi, Maman, dan Sudir bermain bola"

3.57% of the children (one child) has difficulty in identifying specific time, place and characters. Different from the others, this child organizes her narrative as :

Anak-anak bermain-main di halaman rumah orang-orang itu senang bermain-main bola. Hari itu anak-anak libur sekolah. Berbagai orang yang banyak bermain bola. Anak yang bermain bola itu jatuh dan ditolong sama yang melihat yang bermain itu. Anak-anak bermain yang gembira sekali. Yang bermain itu bilang stop diterus-teruskan. (1st paragraph)

This child does not use certain names and she cannot change the character mentioned at the beginning of the story into pronoun, inspite of keeping in using it, so that the readers get confused by it. As a result, the readers cannot catch the meaning or the sense of her story. Besides always repeating the word (anak-anak yang bermain), she puts the word in the wrong places more frequently; as a result, the story loses its sense.

In general, we can see that children are concerned with the characters more rather than with the characteristics. In reality, when someone tells us about a friend of his just by mentioning his friend's name, say the name is John, we will likely ask : "Which John are you talking about ?" ,and of course he should describe him, perhaps he would say : "Who I mean is John with the black hair, white skin, and cute", or other utterances that present the person intended. So, actually physical appearance is necessary to be given if the speaker talks about a character.

However, concerning the pictures, the children consider that it is not necessary to give detailed characteristics of the characters provided that the

readers know or get the point of the story. In other words, just naming them is enough, as long as the children do not call them only by pronoun such as "they" and "he".

Approximately 100 % of the children include the climax of the story which is developed in various ways but with the same point i.e. the owner of the house is angry with the children. Some examples are :

1. "Pak Daman memarahi ketiga anak itu".
2. "Lalu Pak Joko memarahi anak ketiga itu".
3. "Pak Raden keluar dan dengan nada menasehati marah kepada anak-anak".

Usually, a narrative ends with the resolution or the result of the story, which means that the narrator makes a conclusion of what have been talked. There are two groups of the sample relating with this matter. On the one hand, 64.29 %, children do not just stop at the last picture which describe the boys' running away, but they are capable of predicting what will happen next. Children belong to this group clarify that after the children run away because of being afraid of the man, they come to the man the next day to ask for an apology and are willing to repay for the glass they have broken and promise not to play football in front of people's house, but in the play yard. Some examples of this are:

1. "Mereka meminta maaf pada pemilik rumah dan mau mengganti rugi atas pacahnya kaca itu".
2. "Sejak peristiwa itu, mereka tidak berani lagi bermain sepak bola di dekat rumah".

orang lain, tetapi mereka akan bermain di lapangan yang telah disediakan untuk bermain."

3. "...tetapi bermain bola tidak di depan rumah Pak Budi tetapi di lapangan tempat bermain bola dan mereka berjanji tidak akan melakukan perbuatan itu lagi".

Other children that still belong to the same group (who are capable of predicting what happen next), conclude their story by stating the result of the entire story, such as :

1. "Mereka telah mengerti bahwa bermain di halaman rumah orang itu berakibat buruk".
2. "Itulah bahayanya jika kita bermain bola di halaman depan rumah orang itu".

The other group (who cannot predict what happen next), i.e. 35.71 %, end their story by telling that the boys run away when they see the owner goes out of his house. They cannot hyphotesize what the boys will do. They end the story with :

1. "Semua anak langsung lari terbirit-birit menuju rumah masing-masing".
2. "mereka lari terbirit-birit mereka takut ketahuan pemilik rumah yaitu Pak Syarif".
3. "Mereka langsung saja lari ketakutan".

If the narratives are analysed from the structure of narrative point of view, all children are capable of organizing the story well. They begin the narrative by giving introduction, providing certain circumstances and situations of the events. The children do not just mention characters by calling them with pronouns but they give names to the characters they create and moreover describe them in details with characteristics. Also they have knowledge and do not

have difficulties in elaborating the action and making conclusion of what they have discussed.

However, there are other things to be discussed in a narrative, which include about how a narrator uses the language elements, logical operators and chronological aspects. This is explained below.

The children organize their narratives well and elaborate names, place, time and situation of events. so that the narratives evoke universalistic meaning. It means that without seeing the pictures, the readers can understand what the narrator talks about. Telling a story from pictures encourage the children to make explicit their meaning which they are manifesting through language for the persons they are telling the story to. The children consider the possibilities of alternate meanings of their story so that their telling is understandable by all. The children can see that they are telling other people some events so they think they require to make their telling free from the context. In other words, they generate universalistic meanings in the sense that the meaning are free from the context and so understandable by all. About 96.43 % of the children (27 children) are evoked to generate universalistic meaning, while 3.57 % (1 child) generate particularistic meaning in the sense that the meanings are closely tied to the context and will be only fully understood by others if they had access to the context

which originally generate the speech (i.e. the pictures).

A few children under this study have access to wide range of syntactic choices which involve the logical operators, 'karena', 'dan', 'tetapi', but they have difficulties in their use. Difficulties in their use here are in managing the role relationship which such context require. Those children lack of knowledge to place those logical operators, for instances :

1. "Dengan melihat itu Pak Budi akan memarahi anak-anak itu lalu mereka berlari menghindari dari Pak Budi".
2. "Pak Budi senang dengan melihat anak-anak seperti itu, anak-anak yang mau mengakui kesalahannya".
3. "Ternyata permainannya seru juga tetapi yang bermain ada tiga orang".

The words 'dengan' in the first and second examples are wrongly used. It should be the word 'karena' to be used there, because those show causal relationship in the sentences. The word 'tetapi' in the third example should be changed into the word 'dan' because the sentence does not indicate adversed meaning but just shows that the players are three persons.

Among the 28 children, there are about 3 children who cannot manage the relationship of the sentences in their narratives by using logical operators. The rest of the respondents manage and play the logical operators well in the narratives.

In most of the children narratives, repetition always exists. 'Dan', 'lalu', 'kemudian', 'suatu', and

pronouns such as 'mereka', 'dia' are the words that are frequently repeated in sentences. Even in one sentence, those words can be repeated more than twice. Some examples of these cases are :

1. "Anton, Budi, dan Rizki mereka sangat dikenal dikalangan karena mereka sangat nakal mereka semua laki-laki dan mereka tidak pernah membantu orang tua mereka".
2. "Mereka tidak meminta maaf pada Pak Gatot karena mereka takut dan mereka tahu bahwa mereka telah bersalah karena memecahkan jendela kaca milik Pak Gatot".

Although a few children have difficulties with the repetition and with the use of logical operators such as 'karena' and 'tetapi', most of their narratives have universalistic meaning.

Of the total sample, 96,43% use universalistic meaning while 3,57% have particularistic meaning. Universalistic meaning means that the meanings are less tied to the context or it is context-independent, while particularistic meanings are context-tied. In short, it can be said that if the children generate universalistic meaning, then their stories are context-independent, and, conversely, if the children generate particularistic meaning, their stories must be context-tied. These are the second criteria of elaborated and restricted speech.

There are no constraints upon the children's use of language. A few children can interpret what the man (the house owner) said to the children when he was angry. Those children declare that the man want the

children to repay the glass they have broken. The main things here are that most of the children develop their ideas into the story individually according to their own ideas. It means that the children generate meaning that are not bound to the given context. It is necessary to stress once again that if the meanings are universalistic then the story is context-independent, whereas it is context-tied when the meanings are particularistic.

Table 1. The children's language deals with the first and second criteria of elaborated and restricted speech

Children's Language				
	U	P	C-F	C-T
Total Sample	96.43%	3.57%	96.43%	3.57%

Note : U = universalistic C-F = context-free
 P = particularistic C-T = context-tied

The third criteria of elaborated and restricted speech is dealing with the metaphorical and rational aspects. If the speaker wishes to individualize the communication, he is likely to do this by varying the expressive associates of the speech. Under this condition, the speech is likely to have a strong metaphoric element (Bernstein, 1972:165). The opposite of metaphorical element is rationality element. What is meant by rationality is the speech logically acceptable

by the listeners. There are few children under this study who use metaphoric element such as :

1. "Terik matahari, haus dan lapar tidak mereka rasakan, mereka hanya mementingkan kepentingan pribadi di saat semua orang beristirahat pada siang hari. Dengan keringat yang membasahi pipi mereka tetap bermain dengan sorak sorai yang sangat mengganggu orang-orang yang sedang beristirahat".
2. "Dengan segera Pak Akhmad sudah mengetahui bahwa bola itu ialah milik Budi".
3. "Karena kejujuran Budi, Pak Akhmad memberi 3 buah mangga dan 2 buah bola sepak dan Budipun disuruh pulang...".
4. "Lalu haripun sudah siang mereka tidak mau pulang. Karena mereka tidak tahu tata tertib dan mereka sangat nakal".
5. "Lalu mereka menendang bola bersama...."
6. "Lalu setelah 5 menit kemudian mereka lari terbirit-birit....".
7. "Dan Pak Totok segera mengejarnya dan tertangkap semua".

From the examples above, we can see that the children's diction used in the sentences are flowering and are not rational. In example (2), for instance, how come Pak Akhmad immediately knows that the ball belongs to Budi? It is a sentence that is hard to be accepted logically. It is impossible that Pak Akhmad gives 3 manggoes and 2 balls to Budi just because Budi is responsible for what he has done (example 3). In example number 4, the children cannot manage causal relationship to show the relationship of their sentences so they loose their sense. Whatever the children utter concerning

metaphorical element are less acceptable. There are 32.14% of the total sample that use metaphorical element in their language use. The other children (67,86%) base their speech upon rationality. By looking at the percentage has been mentioned, it can be concluded that most of the children have been able to use their rationality well. To examine whether their speech are elaborated or restricted, we need to know how those children use condensed and articulated symbols.

Table 2. Table about the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd criteria.

	Children's Language					
	U	P	C-F	C-T	R	M
T. Sample	96.43%	3.57%	96.43%	3.57%	67.86%	32.14%

Note : R = rationality

M = metaphoric

The last criteria deals with condensed and articulated symbols. Condensed symbols refer to unclear information while articulated symbols refer to clear information. Information here is about the identification made by the author in his story, such as the characters, the time and the place. Condensed symbols are used if the readers or the listeners have already know the history of what the speaker talks about, that means the meaning is particularistic. The other term, articulated symbols, show universalistic meaning since

they give some information required by the readers or the listeners to know what the speaker talks about.

About this matter, 28.57% of the children use condensed symbols, meaning that they do not provide any clear information about what they are concerned about. Of course the rest of the children (71.43%) use articulated symbols.

So far, I have analysed the children's language or the way the children manifest meaning in writing. There are 96.43% of the total sample manifest in universalistic meaning while 3.57% generate particularistic meaning. Again, when the meaning is universalistic, then the story is context-independent and in turn, it is context-tied if the meaning is particularistic. 67.86% of the children draw the speech upon rationality, whereas 32.14% draw upon metaphoric. Condensed symbols are used by 28,57% of the children and 71.43% use articulated symbols.

IV.2.2. Type of family

Type of family can be determined by many factors: educational background of parents, occupation, social-economic condition, the number of children the family has, etc. But, this study does not discuss all these factors, but just concentrate on the type of family in relation to the language socialization used at home.

I imply three types of family, as outlined by Goode (1977), which are called *authoritarian*, *democratic*, and *unconventional*. *Authoritarian* does not allow children to do their wish as freely; whatever the children do must be known by the parents. Parents will not or are reluctant to give reasons and explanation when they forbid their children in doing things. Punishment is the only way being used if children break the rule applied at home or if children do something wrong. *Democratic family* is the ideal type of family. Parents apply their power to children wisely, in the sense that parents know when the children must be punished and time for parents just needing to give advice and warning to children. Punishment is given with explanation and reason. Parents like to give reasons and explanation when the children propose some questions or ask suggestions. Like its name *Unconventional family* seems to ignore the children's reason. Parents do not care about what the children do. Punishment, explanation, reason, advice, and warning are never given to the children.

The type of family can be seen from the indicators of :

1. Problem solving
2. Giving explanation and punishment
3. Applying rules
4. Parents-children relationship

5. Freedom of choice

Of these indicators, I only deals with the four of them, they are problem solving, giving explanation, applying rules, and freedom of choice.

IV.2.2.1. Problem solving

What is meant by problem solving is how far the parents are involved to know children's problems and how the parents solve those problems. Whether the parents use their power to solve the problem or the parents consider the problem together with the children or the parents let the children solve the problem by themselves.

The parents of authoritarian family always know their children's problem and they use their power to solve them, meaning that children do not have their own opinion to consider the problem, but the parents hold full control of the problem.

The democratic parents do not always know their children's problem, the parents do not force the children to tell their problem to parents. If the children ask for some advice or suggestion concerning their problem, the parents try to help them. So the problems are handled and considered by the children and parents.

Children's problems of unconventional family are never known by their parents. The children solve and consider their problem by themselves. The parents do

not give any suggestion to the problem. These condition can be seen at table 3 below :

Table 3. Parents' involvement to children's problem

	O	S.t	N
in child's problem	28.57%	67.86%	3.57%
in child's activity	75%	25%	0

Note : O = often , S.t= sometime N = never

From the result, we can see that 28.57 % of the respondents (parents) always know their children's problems, 67.86 % only sometimes get involve with their children's problem and 3.57% never know their children's problems. Concerning children's activity, 75% parents always know while 25% just sometimes know their children's activity outside the house. Now, it may be concluded that when it is related to children's problem, parents tend to apply authoritarian type, whereas when it is related to children's activity outside the house parents tend to act as democratic parents.

IV.2.2.2. Giving explanation and punishment

Ideally, giving suitable explanation and punishment is very important for the children. Explanation and reason evoke the children to think critically about everything. When the children just

experience punishment in their lives, their thinking will not become broader. Punishment is effective if it is combined with explanation and reason. (Goode, 1977:88)

The parents of authoritarian family are reluctant to give explanation to their members, power and force are preferable to use in such family. When the children do something wrong and break the rules applied at home, the parents do not reluctant to punish them without giving any reason and advice or explanation.

In a democratic family, parents attempt to always give explanation and reason when their children do something wrong, by trying to show the right thing. If punishment is given, it is combined with reason and advice.

Explanation, reason, punishment and advice are never given to the children by the parents of unconventional family. Table 4 describes this condition of the respondent :

Table 4. Providing explanation and punishment by parents

	P	E	I
doing wrong	32.14%	67.86%	0
break the rule	14.29%	85.71%	0

Note : P = punishment E = explanation I = ignore

When children do something wrong according to the parents' point of view, and if the children break the rules of the family, 32.14% and 14.29% of the parents like to punish their children, 67.86% and 85.71% prefer to scold them accompanied with advice. These results show that the parents act democratically when facing the children who do something wrong and break the rule.

IV.2.2.3. Applying rule at home

As has been mentioned before, authoritarian family forces the parents' power to the children. So in applying the rule at home, parents of such family adjust it strictly. The parents of democratic family apply the rule wisely and control the children in obeying the rule. Whereas the unconventional one never cares about the rule of family, so whether the children obey it or not, it does not matter for them.

Of the respondents of this study, 17,86% of the parents adjust the rule strictly, 39.29% apply it wisely, and 42,85% of the parents do not care the children whether they obey it or not.

IV.2.2.4. Providing freedom

Authoritarian parents never provide freedom for the children to do their wishes; whatever the children do are determined by parents, children's opinion are never considered. The children are regarded in

democratic family since their rights and opinions are considered and are noticed by parents. Parents of unconventional family let their children do whatever they wish.

There are about 32.14% of the parents who apply the authoritarian way, 64.29% are democratic and 3,57% are unconventional one. The problem that remains to be discussed is : Do these family types have a relationship with the children's language ? This is observed in the following part.

IV.3. The relationship between the children's language and the type of family : An insight to language socialization.

In the previous section, it has been clarified about the children's language. Apparently, the children of sixth grade of Elementary school generate various ways in expressing their ideas into the written language.

To organize a narrative, most of them know of how to arrange it well. The plot of their story go chronologically. They start the narrative with identification of characters, orientation of time, place and situation of the events.

By this orientation, they generate universalistic meaning, in the sense that without getting involve in the context or in the events, the readers

can understand and catch the meaning of the story. The opposite of universalistic meaning is particularistic one, in which the reader cannot readily understand the speech without looking at the context.

Usually particularistic meaning is used whenever the speaker and the listener have a closer relationship. Sapir, Malinowski, Firth, Vygotsky and Luria, have all pointed out from different points of view that the closer the identifications of the speakers the greater the range of shared interests and the more probable that the speech will take a specific form (Bernstein, 1972:165). Since the speaker and the hearer have closer relationship, the intent of the speaker can be understood well by the listener for they go from the background, interest and worldview that have been familiar for them. As a result, there is less need to raise meanings to the level of explicitness or elaboration.

Universalistic meaning is required whenever there is no closer relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Therefore, the speaker needs to make his speech explicit in order the listener can catch the meaning of his speech.

Kernan (Kernan, 1977:99) said that children of 10-14 years old seem to be more interested in elaborating the background information necessary to a proper interpretation and understanding of the narrative. So it is not surprizing to find that most of

the children under this study try to elaborate the background information.

Concerning rationality and metaphorical elements, it was stated that more than 30% of the children develop their imaginative ideas through metaphorical language. It is a common thing that the children wish to be regarded, to be praised, so in their speech they use flowering words hopefully their written will be good and seem longer.

Condensed and articulated symbols, and context-tied and context-free have the same focus with universalistic and particularistic meaning.

The elaborated speech based upon universalistic meaning, rationality, context-free, and articulated symbols. The restricted one has the basis upon particularistics meaning, metaphor, context-tied, and condensed symbols.

After the data of the children's language are classified and analysed, each point of the speech, as outlined above, are scored. Their languages that refer to elaborate speech are scored 3 whereas those refer to the restricted one are scored 1. So, in this case there will be three classification of the speech, i.e. elaborated, elaborated-restricted, and restricted speech (See Appendix D for the complete list of scores).

It has been stated in chapter III that the

relationship between the two variables will be computed using the formula of D%-value (See Appendix E). The result of such analysis will statistically show whether the two variables are related or not, as explained below.

The results of the analysis show that 3.57% of the total sample (1 child) uses restricted speech, 17.86% indicate elaborate-restricted speech, and 78.57% generate elaborated speech. Bernstein stated that social class has a relationship with children's language, to know whether there is a relationship between the children's language and the type of family, the table below will show about that.

Table 5. The relationship between the children's language and the type of family.

Child's Language	Type of family			Total
	A	D	U	
Elaborated	-	64.29%	14.29%	78.58%
E R	-	17.86%	-	17.86%
Restricted	-	3.57%	-	3.57%

Note : E - R = Elaborated-Restricted

From the Table we can see that 64.29% of the total sample who come from democratic family generate elaborated speech, 17.86% generate elaborated-restricted speech, and 3.57% generate restricted speech. While all of the children from the

unconventional family generate elaborated speech.

To see whether there is a relationship between the two variables, difference percentage (D%) is taken over. It is said that if D% more than 10%, it means there is a relationship between the two variables. From the Table above, A-B = 64.29%, B-C = 40%, A-C = 14.29%, apparently, the D% for those variables is more than 10%, so there is a relationship between the children's language and the type of family.

This relationship can be explained as follows : We can see in Table 5 that most of the parents are of democratic type which correlate with the children's language, i.e. most of them use elaborated language. In other words, we can say that the children's language is elaborated because they come from a democratic family, where parents are accustomed to use reasons, explanation, etc, in their process of language and norms socialization towards the children. Of course there are a border-line cases, i.e. those children whose language is in between elaborated and restricted. However, this constitutes only 18%. It is also interesting to notice that the child using restricted language also comes from a democratic family, but this maybe an exception. With larger population and sample, the picture/result might be different.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION