American Journal of Sciences and Engineering Research

E-ISSN -2348 - 703X, Volume 6, Issue 1, 2023



The Association of Socioeconomic Status and Language Development: A Systematic Review

Zahida Hussain¹; Nisha N. Khawaja²; Tooba Hussain³; Taleah Tariq⁴; Zainab Sadiq⁵

Speech Language Pathologist | MS—SLP, College of Speech Language & Hearing Sciences—Ziauddin University

ABSTRACT:

Objectives: Children and adolescents with lower socioeconomic status (SES) suffer negatively regarding their development and overall health. On standardized language proficiency tests, they frequently fall behind their more privileged peers, creating protracted patterns that culminate in inequalities in school performance. To demonstrate the direct link between poor socioeconomic status and language acquisition across all domains of language development, the following analysis of the pertinent studies has been performed.

Purpose: The following elements are hypothesized to be identified by the investigation presented here: 1. Does any relation occurs between socioeconomic status (SES) and early language abilities across areas in early childhood? 2. Are there any differences in vocabulary size in children with low socioeconomic status, 3. Does having a poor socioeconomic level have any bearing on one's literacy abilities?

Method: To develop a critical examination, a systematic review evaluation was carried out using the scientific literature from Pub Med or Sci-Hub. The readings that were taken into consideration ranged from 2000 to the current.

Conclusion: The results will allow for a better understanding of how SES affects a child's linguistic domains and how the environment can influence the person's brain growth, allowing for the development of policies and initiatives that will close the gaps in school performance and mental well-being.

Keywords: early childhood, linguistic trajectories, verbal abilities, educational resources, parent-child contact, and primary prevention.

I. INTRODUCTION

The term "socioeconomic status" (SES) applies to a person's ability to obtain financial, academic, and social conditions along with the standing in society, privileges, and social class that these resources offer (Duncan et al. 2015, Entwisle & Astone 1994, Mueller & Parcel 1981). Whereas SES is a broad phenomenon that may be evaluated in a variety of ways (Rossi & Oakes 2003), the bulk of various research concentrates on parental profession, household income, and parent's education level, or some combination of these three parameters (Fothergill & Ensminger 2003, Corwyn & Bradley 2002).

Early language development is one of the most vital indicators of future academic performance (Burchinal et al. 2016, Hoff 2013). On standardized speech and language proficiency tests, many kids from lower socioeconomic status (SES) homes perform considerably worse than their classmates by the time they begin school (Ginsborg 2006). According to Hart & Risley's (1995) fundamental study, which determined that the children raised in poverty have heard 30 million fewer words than their more affluent counterparts, has received a lot of publicity. Although all children in normal development acquire native competency in their language, there are individual variations in the pace and course of early language development. Evaluating early language acquisition diversity involves considering the size and quality of verbal information children get from their context (Lyon, Bryk, Haight, Hutten ocher, & Seltzer, 1991; Hoff, 2003, Risley & Hart, 1995).

Socioeconomic status (SES) impacts the information kids receive; one of the key findings from the literature on language acquisition revealed that higher-SES children typically obtain higher-quality information

than lower-SES children. This trend has descending impacts on language acquisition (Weisleder, Marchman, & Fernald, 2013; Hoff, 2006; Hoff, Tardif, 2002, Hart& Risley, 1995).

There are significant differences in how children establish their early linguistic patterns. One of the studies discovered that some babies start talking at the age of the first year while others only at the end of their second year (Bates, Thal, Reznick, Dale, and Fenson (2007). Late talkers catch vocabulary a few months later, but some children show delayed patterns of language learning which effectively reduce degrees of language proficiency (Marchman and Fernald, 2012 Bates, Dale, 1995). Differences in socioeconomic position (SES) are directly proportional to the variation in linguistic outcomes. Children from less privileged families are significantly less verbally and cognitively capable than their more privileged counterparts by the time they begin kindergarten, differences that are indicative of eventual academic success or failure (Lee & Burkam, 2002; Ramey, 2004;). According to Neville and Pakulak (2010), there are significant SES disparities in language proficiency among adults, indicating the lifetime effects of various endogenous and extrinsic factors. In research conducted since the 1990s (e.g., Bereiter & Englemann, 1996; Deutsch, Katz, & Jensen, 1998), it has been frequently demonstrated that kindergarten readiness for children from less advantaged homes is lower than for children from more advantaged families.

The Longitudinal Early Childhood Research (ECLS-K), which conducted a detailed review of early-age children's scores in math and literacy based on a cross-sectional sample nationwide, revealed that children in the highest SES-quintile group had already outperformed those in the lowest group by a factor of 60% before entering kindergarten. The reading achievement of children in the highest SES percentile was. Seven standard deviations (SD) units were more elevated than that of children in the middle SES percentile and the lowest SES percentile.5 SD units lower (Burkam and Lee (2002). Nelson, Welsh and Greenberg (2011) discovered a strong association between language delay severity and other academic and social-emotional deficits present by age four. Moreover, severely low-income populations exhibit linguistic inequalities related to socioeconomic status (Galasso, L. Fernald and Weber 2011).

Early language development is one of the best indicators of future performance in school and preparation for school (Hoff 2013, Burchinal et al. 2016). However, by the time they enter school, many students from lower socioeconomic status (SES) homes do significantly worse than their classmates on tests of language comprehension and production (Ginsborg 2006). One of the studies has found that SES-related differences in early verbal contexts impact interactions and opportunities for learning languages (Rowe 2012, Cartmill et al., Goldin-Meadow et al. 2013). These initial variations in exposure to the language and practice lead to gaps in language skills that also stay constant or increase through age, claim Walker et al. (1994). These variances also reflect the academic path followed in primary and secondary school (Burchinal et al. 2002; Alexander and Entwisle 1999).

Socioeconomic status (SES) and communication skills are multifaceted variables, and various variables that influence language development covariate with SES, making it challenging to identify the correlation between SES and communication skills. (Toll et al.,2002). Socialization language acquisition theorists have also made reasonable criticisms of the literature's overemphasis on the linguistic deficiencies of children from low-income households without paying attention to their abilities (Johnson 2015, Sperry & Miller 2012), as well as the requirement of the broader acceptance of language socialization theories. The importance of increasing the application of anthropological strategies that take into consideration cultural differences as well as raised valid questions about the literature's overemphasis on the linguistic deficiencies of children from low-income backgrounds households without focusing on their skills and talents (Sperry et al. 2015, Johnson 2015, Miller & Sperry 2012, Ochs & Schieffelin1984).

Inside this analysis, we merge diverse and frequently contradictory approaches to examining acquisition to start understanding the complex link between socioeconomic status (SES) and language proficiency. Firstly, the traditional psycholinguistic approach considers how language stimulus leads to the development of language and learning (Lillo-Martin and Crain 1999). Secondly, environmental biology theory primarily focuses on the social settings, varying from factors that have more direct consequences for outcomes (like home, childcare services, and social groups) to those with more long-lasting ones (like culture, history, SES) (Morris

and Bronfenbrenner 1998). Both methods have investigated the relationship with few significant deviations between language acquisition and linguistic contexts (Hoff 2006, Gallaway and Richards 1994, Hoff-Ginsberg and Shatz 1982).

II. The Association of Communication Skills and Socioeconomic Status in Domains of Language

Children from low-SES families usually perform less compared to more rich peers on examinations of expressive and receptive language skills (Bowey 1995; Hart & Risley 1995, Walker et al. 1994, Arriaga et al. 1998; Fernald et al. 2013, Rodriguez and Tamis). However, long-term benefits like storytelling or pragmatic aspects of language have yet to get much consideration (Corsaro et al. 2002). Before exploring the processes influencing this complex connection, we initially look at the impacts of SES on several linguistic levels of ability in younger years.

Pre-linguistic Development

The building blocks of communication start to form even before birth, even if an infant may not utter a single word until about the time of her first birthday (DeCasper & Fifer 1980, Kisilevskyet al. 2003). The crucial language skills such as eye tracking, gesturing and pointing learned by babies in the year of life predict subsequent language courses and promote language development in children (Goldin-Meadow and Iverson 2005). Both the behavioral prerequisites of language development, including the tendency to explore the natural universe, use actions, and interact with communicative intention, and earlier changes in the regions of the brain that promote language learning, are supported by data.

As infants learn to move around independently, they use their senses of touch, hearing, smell, and taste to discover their surroundings. Infants from low-SES homes showed decreased overall levels of oral and physical item exploration between 6 and 12 months (Clearfield et al. 2014). In high-SES families showed higher access to a playful environment and application of gestures involved in the play during caregiver communication interaction as early as 14 months relative to the low-SES counterparts. These SES-related differences in gesture use indicated changes in vocabulary knowledge at 54 months; according to Rowe and Goldin-Meadow (2009), such differences appear to be transmitted by caregivers' nonverbal engagement. Results from reported work were validated by neuroimaging studies that found significant SES disparities in regional brain volume in areas related to language and executive function (Hanson et al. 2013, Farah and Hackman 2009, Farah et al. 2006, Noble et al. 2012).

Future research in this crucial area is needed because low SES families have a high prevalence of maternal depression (Turney 2012, Lyons-Ruth et al. 1990 McCue Horwitz et al. 2007), and since the psychosocial distress is inversely connected with the expansion of vocabulary (Pan et al. 2005).

Vocabulary Development

The children's expressive and receptive vocabulary is the most obvious indicator of SES differences. Infants from high-SES homes have more expressive vocabulary than their peers from low-SES families by 18 months (Fernald et al. 2013). One of the prominent reports is that the children of high-income households produce twice as many words by the age of three compared to low-income household children (Hart & Risley (1995). SES has been positively correlated with vocabulary growth in some additional analyses with objections about the limited data, scope, and universal applicability of these findings (Johnson 2015, Sperry et al. 2015, Dudley-Marling & Lucas 2009).

The Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) revealed that low-income children's expressive vocabulary acquisition trailed by 15 months compared to their more prosperous peers (Machin and Blanden 2010). Longitudinal Study of Australian Children (LSAC) reported eight monthly differences in receptive vocabulary development of Children from low-SES families than high-SES families (Taylor et al. 2013).

Other scholars contend that it is not a good idea to equate language with knowledge and abstract thought (Miller & Sperry 2012). The vast majority of standardized vocabulary examinations are highly regimented, and profoundly lower SES backgrounds may do worse on tests due to their exposure to the mainstream, middle-

class society (Gutierrez-Clellen & Pena 2001). SES discrepancies may, therefore, rather than the linguistic deficiencies of children from lower-SES parents, reflect cultural disparities in language socialization (Miller & Sperry 2012). New assessment instruments approved for use with culturally and linguistically varied youngsters require various language evaluation techniques (Pena and Gutierrez-Clellen 2001).

Syntactic Development

Along with vocabulary, grammatical development displays complexities associated with SES. Standardized speech and language testing results revealed that SES impacted the grammatical development and the range and complexity of sentence patterns children created during interaction with the family (Huttenlocher et al. 2010 Vasilyeva et al. 2008). Past surveys from a sample group of toddlers who completed a computational language assessment showed a difference of approximately 24 months in syntax comprehension scores between kids from lower-SES parents at age five and children from higher-SES homes at age 3. (Hirsh-Pasek et al. 2015b).

Literacy Development

Disparities in language proficiency caused by SES contribute to differences in literacy achievement after children learn to read and write (Lee & Burkam 2002, Walker et al. 1994). One renowned paper conducted an analysis that revealed that the highest SES quintile had reading skills that were 1.2 standard deviations higher than those from the lowest SES quintile (20%) upon admission to the school (Burkam and Lee 2002). Surprisingly, by the conclusion of the third grade, more than 80% of low-income students still struggle with reading (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2013). Low-SES pupils were more likely than students from middle- or high-SES homes to experience reading challenges from third through eighth grade (Kieffer 2010). Children's writing abilities show a similar achievement disparity. In the first grade, writing quality and output differed across students from various SES backgrounds (Kim et al. 2015). According to a survey, high-SES students in grade 12 were double as likely as low-SES students to obtain excellent or advanced scores on reading ability exams (Schmidt and Camara 1999).

One study found that preschool admission knowledge base was a better indicator of reading proficiency in grade 5 than early literacy scores (Grissmer et al. 2010). Children who read aloud to them frequently often catch up on the concept of "tale syntax", which further aids in understanding and remembering stories (Stein & Glenn 1979, Anderson & Pearson 1984). A story syntax model needs to make it easier to absorb levels and place the key aspects that are usually assessed on reading ability examinations.

III. DISCUSSION

Language scores are closely related to SES. Across countries, nationalities, and first languages, this connection is strong. The linkages illustrated by this association cover a wide range of areas of language, from pragmatics to vocabulary, and they are also broad. Because of this early association, language variations can be observed from childhood into adulthood. However, this relationship is unique and can be treated appropriately. Despite popular belief, new studies suggest that in countries where welfare policies assure more constant access to good-quality health services and education (such as Australia), the consequences of early life SES on intellectual ability and school performance can be neutralized and or overturned (Bates and Tucker-Drob (2015).

The manner a child develops, the number and quality of care provider connections, and the range of learning resources available at home and within society are all variables that might impact SES on a child's language development. Initially, children who are typically growing show remarkable natural differences in overall teaching strategies, which affects how well they learn languages. The various paths of language acquisition are nevertheless linked to these cognitive disparities, even though variations in speaking skills may generate some.

The relationship between communication and SES has been evaluated in this review, which could impact how children develop their language abilities. As stated above, early childhood experiences significantly

influence variation in language proficiency due to environment, social setting and parental interaction, as well as genetic variables, which also explain variations in children's verbal skills. Children have a greater chance of being shielded from unpleasant experiences and fulfilling their holistic development in homes where enough tools and resources are available as opposed to families with limited resources. Children from middle and low and higher-SES families experience drastically different physical conditions of daily life in terms of noise level, cleanliness, hazardous conditions, safety and pollution exposure, and access to essential resources such as proper nutrition and medical treatment. Concerning these contextual factors, there are also well-known variations in the calibre of parent-child relationships among households with varying SES.

According to the studies mentioned earlier, parent involvement and parental income are linked to the regular contact that family shares with their children. Remarkably, more educated and privileged parents engage in more conversation with their kids, employ a more comprehensive vocabulary, make longer statements, and create fewer statements that instruct their children in conduct. A coordinated effort is required to develop multilevel interventions at the person, society, and immigration levels to target changes that encourage better language paths for all children in a way that verifies the rich and formative linguistic capabilities of children from various socioeconomic statuses, ethnic, and cultural perspectives.

As mentioned, Children with a low SES may experience a discrepancy among demands in their school and home situations. In contrast, children with high socioeconomic backgrounds may acquire abilities that can be transferred seamlessly to a classroom or test set. The most critical matters for additional investigation are assessing children's knowledge level and increasing the quality of literacy education while considering the range of preliteracy activities in various cultural and socioeconomic structures.

IV. CONCLUSION

We concluded by analyzing the papers that children usually grow up and have remarkable natural differences in their teaching strategies, which impacts how they learn the language. Even though some of these cognitive variations could be due to linguistic exposure changes, they are linked to various developmental language pathways. Factors contributing language learning between a child and its caregiver include: a) the number and quality of linguistic knowledge, b) the dependability and symmetry of connection, and c) parental warmth and sensitivity. However, additional research is required to assess and address the impact of socioeconomic status on language acquisition and academic achievements.

V. References

- 1. Ramos F, Krashen S. 1998. The impact of one trip to the public library: Making books available may be the best incentive for reading. *Read. Teach.* 51:614–15.
- 2. Raviv T, Kessenich M, Morrison FJ. 2004. A mediational model of the association between socioeconomic status and three-year-old language abilities: the role of parenting factors. *Early Child. Res. Q.* 19:528–47.
- 3. Reese E, Leyva D, Sparks A, Grolnick W. 2010. Maternal elaborative reminiscing increases low-income children's narrative skills relative to dialogic reading. *Early Educ. Dev.* 21:318–42.
- 4. Ridge KE, Weisberg DS, Ilgaz H, Hirsh-Pasek KA, Golinkoff RM. 2015. Supermarket speak: increasing talk among low-socioeconomic status families. *Mind Brain Educ.* 9:127–35.
- 5. Rindermann H, Baumeister AE. 2015. Parents' SES versus parental educational behavior and children's development: a reanalysis of the Hart and Risley study. *Learn. Individ. Differ.* 37:133–38.
- 6. Roben CK, Cole PM, Armstrong LM. 2013. Longitudinal relations among language skills, anger expression, and regulatory strategies in early childhood. *Child Dev*. 84:891–905.
- 7. Robinson CC, Larsen JM, Haupt JH. 1995. Picture book reading at home: a comparison of Head Start and middle-class preschoolers. *Early Educ. Dev.* 6:241–52.
- Rodriguez ET, Tamis-LeMonda CS. 2011. Trajectories of the home learning environment across the first 5 years: associations with children's vocabulary and literacy skills at prekindergarten. *Child Dev.* 82:1058–75.

- Rodriguez ET, Tamis-LeMonda CS, Spellmann ME, Pan BA, Raikes H, et al. 2009. The formative role of home literacy experiences across the first three years of life in children from low-income families. *J. Appl. Dev. Psychol.* 30:677–94.
- 10. Rowe ML. 2012. A longitudinal investigation of the role of quantity and quality of child-directed speech in vocabulary development. *Child Dev.* 83:1762–74.
- 11. Rowe ML, Goldin-Meadow S. 2009a. Early gesture selectively predicts later language learning. *Dev. Sci.* 12:182–87.
- 12. Rowe ML, Goldin-Meadow S. 2009b. Differences in early gesture explain SES disparities in child vocabulary size at school entry. *Science* 323:951–53.
- 13. Segal-Drori O, Korat O, Shamir A, Klein PS. 2010. Reading electronic and printed books with and without adult instruction: effects on emergent reading. *Read. Writ.* 23:913–30.
- 14. Shonkoff JP. 2000. Science, policy, and practice: three cultures in search of a shared mission. *Child Dev.* 71:181–87.
- 15. Shonkoff JP, Garner AS, Siegel BS, Dobbins MI, Earls MF, et al. 2012. The lifelong effects of early childhood adversity and toxic stress. *Pediatrics* 129:e232–46.
- 16. Smeets DJH, Bus AG. 2015. The interactive animated e-book as a word learning device for kindergartners. *Appl. Psycholinguist.* 36:899–920.
- 17. Spencer EJ, Schuele CM. 2012. An examination of fast mapping skills in preschool children from families with low socioeconomic status. *Clin. Linguist. Phon.* 26:845–62.
- 18. Sperry DE, Miller PJ, Sperry L. 2015. *Is there really a word gap?* Presented at Annu. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 114th, Denver, CO.
- 19. Stein CL, Glenn C. 1979. An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children. In *New Directions in Discourse Processing*, ed. RO Freedle, 2:53–120. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- 20. Suskind D, Leffel KR, Hernandez MW, Sapolich SG, Suskind E, et al. 2013. An exploratory study of "quantitative linguistic feedback": effect of LENA feedback on adult language production. *Commun. Disord. Q.* 34:199–209.
- 21. Swingley D. 2009. Contributions of infant word learning to language development. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* 364:3617–32.
- 22. Taylor BA, Dearing E, McCartney K. 2004. Incomes and outcomes in early childhood. *J. Hum. Resour.* 39:980–1007.
- 23. Taylor CL, Christensen D, Lawrence D, Mitrou F, Zubrick SR. 2013. Risk factors for children's receptive vocabulary development from four to eight years in the longitudinal study of Australian children. *PLOS ONE* 8: e73046.
- 24. Tamis-LeMonda CS, Bornstein MH. 2002. Maternal responsiveness and early language acquisition. Adv.
- 25. Allington R. 1984. Content, coverage, and contextual reading in reading groups. J. Read. Behav. 16:85–96.
- 26. Allington R, McGill-Franzen A, Camilli G, Williams L, Graff J, et al. 2010. Addressing summer reading setback among economically disadvantaged elementary students. *Read. Psychol.* 31:411–27.
- 27. Alt M, Meyers C, Ancharski A. 2012. Using principles of learning to inform language therapy design for children with specific language impairment. *Int. J. Lang. Commun. Disord.* 47:487–98.
- 28. AltM, MeyersC, OglivieT, NicholasK, ArizmendiG. 2014.Cross-situationalstatisticallybasedwordlearning intervention for late-talking toddlers. *J. Commun. Disord.* 52:207–20.
- 29. Anderson RC, Pearson PD. 1984. A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. In *Handbook of Reading Research*, ed. PD Pearson, pp. 255–91. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Annie E. Casey Found. 2013. Early warning! Why reading by the end of third grade matters. Special rep., Annie E. Casey Found., Baltimore. http://www.aecf.org/resources/early-warning-why-reading-by-theendof-third-grade-matters/.
- 31. AramD, FineY, ZivM. 2013.Enhancingparent–childsharedbook-readinginteractions: promotingreferences to the book's plot and socio-cognitive themes. *Early Child. Res. Q.* 28:111–22.

American Journal of Sciences and Engineering Research

- 32. Arriaga RI, Fenson L, Cronan T, Pethick SJ. 1998. Scores on the MacArthur Communicative Development Inventory of children from low- and middle-income families. *Appl. Psycholinguist.* 19:209–23.
- 33. Blair C, Raver CC. 2012.