

From at a different  
pace than their



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

From the moment we are born, our environment prepares us for this journey we call life. We learn to communicate both verbally and non-verbally.

In my opinion and based on three studies, socioeconomic status, the child's gender, the amount of language they hear from their caregivers, word mapping, and social intent all effect the child's vocabulary size. According to Spencer, Clegg, & Stackhouse, " the links between socioeconomic disadvantage and early language development are well documented with reports of up to 50% of young children from areas of socioeconomic disadvantage having language delay. According to Pasek, Golinkoff, and Hennon (2006), research states girls showed a quasi-linear positive gain in language across secondary school, while boys began with a decline and then accelerated. To begin with, socioeconomic status is categorized an individual's or family's social status regarding income and occupation.

I believe children from a low socioeconomic status have a disadvantage in learning language as opposed to a higher socioeconomic status. Language acquisition is the process that humans can perceive, dissect, and understand language. Much research has been conducted on infants and children to support this. According to Spencer, Clegg, and Stackhouse (2012), many young children in that are from areas of social disadvantage learn words at a different pace than their peers that are more advantaged. Many studies have been published to support this. However, one study wanted to focus on young adolescents to get a bigger picture on the long-term effects of vocabulary size in students from a low socioeconomic background. The study was conducted on participants ages 9-16 in two different schools. One school contained children from low socioeconomic backgrounds while the other

school contained participants from a background of socioeconomic advantage.

These students were assessed on receptive skill at word skills and nonverbal word skills. The results suggested that students from a lower socioeconomic background scored significantly lower on all language measures. I believe if more studies were to be conducted the data would remain relatively the same. Next, gender plays a major role in vocabulary acquisition. In this modern day, women are still fighting for equality.

For many years, we've literally been put to the backburner in terms of education, jobs, and social statuses. Data is now supporting that girls are now outperforming boys. According to the article School Engagement and Language Achievement, girls are showing a much better performance than boys on almost all educational outcomes. Moreover, women are now entering in to fields that are stereotypically led by men. So why are the boys now the underachievers? A major determination factor falls under the fact that boys tend to be less engaged in school than girls (Van de Gaer, Leuven, Pustjens, Damme, & Munter, 2009).

Many studies that have been conducted have shown that there are little to no gender differences in elementary school. The difference begins to appear in secondary school. A research conducted among secondary students found that there is a big decline in boys' attitudes toward homework and effort for language. An interesting factor was that the data also revealed boys were less interested in learning tasks too as opposed to girls. The research on language achievement in both genders in secondary school was interesting.

The data revealed boys showed less learning girls but only during the first 2 years of secondary school. In retrospect many factors that affect boys could include puberty. Nevertheless, as you can see gender does affect language. Finally, language acquisition is the process that humans can perceive, dissect, and understand language. According to Hennon, Pasek, Golinkoff, (2006) an essential task in language acquisition is mapping words on to objects, actions, and events. This process is phenomenal. Babies can map and associate words such as mommy to figures and objects. A suggested theory is they will only do this that are perpetually interesting and fascinating to them.

Children are sensitive to social information (Hennon, Pasek, Golinkoff, 2006). This means that babies are listening and watching both verbal and nonverbal cues. If the person shows excitement verbally and nonverbally; such as pointing or smiling when teaching a new word, the child will most likely retain information even if the object is not fascinating. In a study titled *Are 10-Month-Olds Mapping Words to Objects or to Spatial Locations*, the purpose was to see if two interpretations of words to objects and word to spatial location. Infants were exposed to boring and interesting objects. What the data revealed was infants are learning words or are at least mapping words onto perceptually salient objects in their environment. Coincidentally, interesting objects regardless of social cues were easier for them to map. The results of this experiment showed that social input is what paves the way to early vocabulary.

Furthermore, the study shows that infants begin relying less on their own perspective and more on learning words to learning. Concepts like this are

amazing to draw on. Word mapping and social input regardless play a role in learning language (Hennon, Pasek, Golinkoff, 2006) In conclusion, many factors effect a child's vocabulary size. In my opinion and based on three studies, socioeconomic status, the child's gender, and word mapping and social intent are all major factors that affect language acquisition. Children of low socioeconomic status have a great disadvantage in regards to language acquisitions. Research on gender and vocabulary size show girls are outperforming boys.

Also, word mapping and social interest on objects help children develop better language skills.