Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English
Vol 4, No. 2 (2015), 149-166

# The Effects of Mothers' Age, Educational Level, Occupation and Children's Birth Order on Iranian Preschoolers' Communicative Performance

**Arezoo Daneshvar [1], Firroz Sadighi [2]**

(1) Department of Foreign Languages, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz Branch, Shiraz, Iran, arezoo.daneshvar@yahoo.com

(2) Department of Foreign Languages, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz Branch, Shiraz, Iran, firoozsadighi@yahoo.com

**Abstract.** The researchers aim was to find out the potential effects of some maternal factors such as age, educational level, occupation as well as children's birth order on the communicative performance of preschoolers in Iran. This study was conducted with 31 preschoolers selected from Bahar Language Institute in Shiraz, Iran. The required data about mothers and children were gathered through a questionnaire developed by the researchers and an interview done by two raters. Following the process of data collection, independent samples t-test was employed, the results of which indicated that there was a significant difference between the pronunciation of children based on their mothers' education level (sig.=.03, $p<.05$). It was also found out that there was a significant difference (sig.=.019, $p<.05$) between the total communicative performances of working mothers' children (M=85.94) and that of children whose mothers were unemployed housewives (M=80.82). However, the researchers found no significant difference between communicative performance of these two groups whose mothers belonged to different age groups, i.e. below 35 and above 35. Also,

the results demonstrated a significant difference (sig.=.009, p<.05) in the pronunciation of first children compared to that of second kids.

**Keywords:** Age, educational level, occupation, birth order, communicative performance, first language acquisition

## 1. Introduction

Although many people are of the belief that first language acquisition is a simple instinctive phenomenon, it is one of the most prominent complexities over which human beings make attempts to gain mastery (Mac Whinney, 2002). That is why so far many scholars have conducted strands of research regarding first language acquisition and crucial factors that have significant impacts on this process so as to explore some of these complexities and wipe out the confusion of facts that surrounds us.

Owing to the fact that mothers are children's first teachers and that family serves as children's first language acquisition place, mothers' traits such as their age, educational level and job are of great importance in children's first language acquisition. Besides, it is crystal clear that children's' birth order has crucial impacts on the child-mother relationship and the amount of language input children receive. However, in spite of the fact that body of research conducted so far indicates that maternal and paternal educational level, financial position of the family as well as children's birth order make contributions to child language development, there is still a dearth of information on the way mothers' age, educational level, and occupation influence child's language development in general and communicative performance in particular. Furthermore, there is very little literature on the possible impacts of child birth order on the communication of preschoolers or kindergarten children in Iran. In consequence, this study directly addresses this gap in the research by investigating the likely effects of maternal education level, age and occupation as well as child birth order on the development of communicative performance of preschoolers or kindergarten children.

## 2. Research Questions

This study aimed at investigating the effects of mothers' traits such as age, education, and occupations as well as impacts of child birth order on child's L1 communicative performance. More specifically, the study seeks to find answers to these questions:

1. Does mothers' education level regardless of their age contribute to Iranian preschoolers' communicative performance development?
2. Does mothers' occupation contribute to Iranian preschoolers' communicative performance development?
3. Does mothers' age influence Iranian preschoolers' communicative performance development?
4. Does Iranian preschoolers' birth order influence their communicative performance development?

## 3. Literature Review

So far, the role of family and parents in children's first language acquisition has been taken for granted by scholars and linguists. That is why the last three decades have witnessed a rise in the number of studies that have focused on parental impacts and interaction with their children language development (Pancsofar &Vernon-Feagans, 2010).

According to Hoff (2009), Mowder (1997), and Shonkoff and Philips (2000), children's rapid language development in general and the acquisition of communicative skills in particular occur within the first years of children's life. Also, researchers such as Olson (1986), whose study focused on the impacts of some maternal features on children's first language acquisition skills in general and their communicative competence and reading and listening comprehension skills in particular, stated that occurrence of language development is especially influenced by mothers who gradually provide children with the most input as they grow up.

Hoff-Ginsberg (1991), and Lewis and Wilson (1972) were some other researchers claiming that mothers of different social classes have different effects on children's language acquisition. Besides, Kagan and Tulkin (1972) realized that middle class mothers were inclined to have more meaningful verbal communication with their children whereas low-

income mothers were claimed to have less verbal interactions with their children (Hoff- Ginsberg, 1991).

Although many studies centered on the crucial role of mothers as the primary caregiver in child language development and communication, it was claimed by Coleman (1988) and Amato (1998) that fathers' education, traits and knowledge might lead to children's language development and improve their competency in the acquisition of communication and language skills. Also, it was discovered by Cabrera, Tamis-LeMonda, Bradley, Hofferth, and Lamb (2007) that fathers' education has positive impacts on children's language development at 24 and 36 months of age.

Furthermore, it was asserted that quality and quantity of interactions among fathers and children may be influenced by paternal education (Ahmeduzzaman & Roopnarine, 1992; Coley & Chase-Lansdale, 1999; Gavin, Black, Minor, Abel, Papas, & Bentley, 2002; Yogman, Kindlonher, & Earls, 1995) as well as maternal education (Hoff, 2006) even within low-income families and societies.

In addition, according to the lines of research conducted by Hart and Risley (1995), Hoff (2006), Hoff, Laursen and Tardif (2002), and Hoff-Gingsberg (1998) , children's advanced language development is linked to maternal education level inasmuch as highly-educated mothers are inclined to have more and better interaction with their children compared to less educated ones.

Also, in a study, Evans (2004) illustrated that there is an association between the level of family income and children's language development. In other words, in families with low income, children suffer from language development delays.

In 2004, Bornstein, Leach & Haynes and in 1998, Hoff- Gingsberg took the role of child birth order into account and stated that first-born children outperformed later born children regarding language development. They associated child birth order with their early vocabulary competence.

Moreover, some researchers such as Laible (2004), Lewis (1999) and Vernon-Feagnas, Pancsofar, Willoughby, Odom, Quade, and Cox (2008)

investigated the role of child temperament in their language development. Based on Laible's (2004) research findings, mothers of preschoolers provide their children with more elaborations during language tasks particularly when they receive more negative reactivity from their children.

## 4. Method

### 4.1. Participants

This study was conducted with 31 preschoolers studying English at Bahar, one of the language learning institutes in Shiraz, Iran. Subjects' age ranged from five to six years and they were both male and female students. They were asked to describe pictures shown to them and state what they thought about them .They were also requested to answer some general questions in order that raters could evaluate their communicative performance. Furthermore, in order to make a friendly atmosphere, children were given some chocolates and their voice was recorded without taking notes by the researchers and their assistant during the interview to make them feel comfortable and relaxed to show their actual communicative performance.

### 4.2. Instruments

In order to conduct the present study, the researchers used a questionnaire and interviews done with children. The questionnaire made by the researchers consisted of four items. Children's mothers were given the questionnaire in order to elicit information about their age, job, education level and the birth order of their child under study. Furthermore, to evaluate children's communicative performance, they were interviewed. In order to have a better assessment of children's communicative performance, interviews were done by two raters. To do so, they demonstrated some pictures to children and asked them to describe whatever they saw or what they thought about pictures as well as asking them to answer some general questions. It is worthy of mentioning that the inter-rater reliability of the interviews was calculated, the results of which indicated that there was a significant correlation (.94) between the raters' assessment. Thus, it was concluded that the assessments enjoyed high inter-rater reliability.

### 4.3. Data collection

Children's mothers were required to fill in the questionnaire about their age, education level, and employment, as well as their children's birth order. Meanwhile, in order to minimize the effect of children's potential stress and maximize their concentration, first a friendly atmosphere was made through giving some chocolates to children at the beginning of the interview and recording their voice without taking notes by the researchers and their assistant during the interview to make them feel comfortable and relaxed to show their actual communicative performance. Then, they were asked to answer the questions in a silent class and there was no time limit. Children's communicative performance was evaluated based on their fluency and coherence, accuracy and grammatical range, lexical resources, pronunciation and discoursal and pragmatic features. As for scoring the children's communicative performance, each of these subcategories of verbal communicative performance was evaluated and scored from zero to twenty.

### 4.4. Data analysis

As the main step in data analysis, independent-samples *t*-tests were run to determine the difference in children's communicative performance due to the impact of their mothers' age, education level or employment.

## 5. Results and Discussion

An independent samples *t*-test was performed to determine the differences between the communicative performances of children whose mothers' education level was below diploma and those whose mothers were above diploma. The results presented in tables 1 and 2 reports that statistically there is a significant difference between the pronunciation of children whose mothers' education level was above diploma and that of children who had below-diploma mothers (sig.=.03, $p<.05$). Concerning the mean scores, tables 1 and 2 illustrate that the children whose mothers education degrees were above diploma (M=17.42) had better pronunciation performance in comparison with kids whose mothers were below diploma (M=16.44).

**Table 1.** Group Statistics

| | Mother's education | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fluency and Coherence | (Below) /Diploma | 18 | 16.6389 | 1.08201 | .25503 |
| | Above Diploma | 13 | 16.8846 | 1.64765 | .45698 |
| Accuracy and Grammatical Range | (Below) /Diploma | 18 | 16.6389 | 1.23438 | .29095 |
| | Above Diploma | 13 | 17.0000 | 2.15058 | .59646 |
| Lexical Resources | (Below) /Diploma | 18 | 16.6389 | 1.09552 | .25822 |
| | Above Diploma | 13 | 16.8846 | 1.59627 | .44273 |
| Pronunciation | (Below) /Diploma | 18 | 16.4444 | 1.16175 | .27383 |
| | Above Diploma | 13 | 17.4231 | 1.33613 | .37058 |
| Discoursal and Pragmatic Features | (Below) /Diploma | 18 | 16.2222 | 1.08766 | .25636 |
| | Above Diploma | 13 | 16.8846 | 1.29347 | .35875 |
| Total Score | (Below) /Diploma | 18 | 82.5833 | 5.14281 | 1.21217 |
| | Above Diploma | 13 | 85.0769 | 7.36220 | 2.04191 |

**Table 2.** Independent-samples t-test

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Fluency and Coherence | Equal variances assumed | .295 | .591 | -.502 | 29 | .620 | -.24573 | .48963 | -1.24714 | .75568 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.470 | 19.316 | .644 | -.24573 | .52332 | -1.33984 | .84839 |
| Accuracy and Grammatical Range | Equal variances assumed | 2.088 | .159 | -.592 | 29 | .558 | -.36111 | .60981 | -1.60831 | .88609 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.544 | 17.683 | .593 | -.36111 | .66364 | -1.75716 | 1.03494 |
| Lexical Resources | Equal variances assumed | .398 | .533 | -.509 | 29 | .614 | -.24573 | .48258 | -1.23272 | .74127 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.479 | 19.925 | .637 | -.24573 | .51252 | -1.31509 | .82364 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pronunciation | Equal variances assumed | .003 | .954 | -2.174 | 29 | .038 | -.97863 | .45020 | -1.89940 | -.05787 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -2.124 | 23.695 | .044 | -.97863 | .46077 | -1.93026 | -.02700 |
| Discoursal and Pragmatic Features | Equal variances assumed | .106 | .747 | -1.546 | 29 | .133 | -.66239 | .42847 | -1.53872 | .21393 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.502 | 23.128 | .147 | -.66239 | .44093 | -1.57425 | .24946 |
| Total Score | Equal variances assumed | .772 | .387 | -1.112 | 29 | .275 | -2.49359 | 2.24171 | -7.07840 | 2.09123 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.050 | 20.179 | .306 | -2.49359 | 2.37460 | -7.44411 | 2.45693 |

According to the results of independent samples *t*-tests in tables 3 and 4, there was also a significant difference (sig.=.019, p<.05) between the total communicative performances of working mothers' children (M=85.94) and that of children whose mothers were unemployed housewives (M=80.82). Moreover, these two groups were observed to be significantly different regarding these variables: the fluency and coherence (sig.=.031), accuracy and grammatical range (sig.=.006), and lexical resources (sig.=.18). Based on the findings demonstrated in tables 3 and 4, the children whose mothers were at work performed better in terms of fluency and coherence (M=17.23), accuracy and grammatical range (M=17.50), and lexical resources (M=17.23).

**Table 3.** Group statistics

| | Mother's job | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fluency and Coherence | on the Job | 17 | 17.2353 | .83137 | .20164 |
| | out of a Job | 14 | 16.1429 | 1.58634 | .42397 |
| Accuracy and Grammatical Range | on the Job | 17 | 17.5000 | 1.13192 | .27453 |
| | out of a Job | 14 | 15.9286 | 1.81720 | .48567 |
| Lexical Resources | on the Job | 17 | 17.2353 | 1.03256 | .25043 |
| | out of a Job | 14 | 16.1429 | 1.39268 | .37221 |

| | Mother's job | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pronunciation | on the Job | 17 | 17.1176 | 1.26897 | .30777 |
| | out of a Job | 14 | 16.5357 | 1.33682 | .35728 |
| Discoursal and Pragmatic Features | on the Job | 17 | 16.8529 | 1.07187 | .25997 |
| | out of a Job | 14 | 16.0714 | 1.25357 | .33503 |
| Total Score | on the Job | 17 | 85.9412 | 4.76603 | 1.15593 |
| | out of a Job | 14 | 80.8214 | 6.69273 | 1.78871 |

**Table 4.** Independent-samples t-test

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | Sig. | T | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Fluency and Coherence | Equal variances assumed | 4.309 | .047 | 2.464 | 29 | .020 | 1.09244 | .44340 | .18558 | 1.99929 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.327 | 18.766 | .031 | 1.09244 | .46947 | .10899 | 2.07589 |
| Accuracy and Grammatical Range | Equal variances assumed | 3.025 | .093 | 2.944 | 29 | .006 | 1.57143 | .53375 | .47979 | 2.66306 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.817 | 20.901 | .010 | 1.57143 | .55789 | .41090 | 2.73195 |
| Lexical Resources | Equal variances assumed | 1.837 | .186 | 2.507 | 29 | .018 | 1.09244 | .43574 | .20125 | 1.98362 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.435 | 23.518 | .023 | 1.09244 | .44862 | .16553 | 2.01934 |
| Pronunciation | Equal variances assumed | .269 | .608 | 1.240 | 29 | .225 | .58193 | .46911 | -.37751 | 1.54138 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.234 | 27.257 | .228 | .58193 | .47156 | -.38521 | 1.54907 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Discoursal and Pragmatic Features | Equal variances assumed | .606 | .442 | 1.872 | 29 | .071 | .78151 | .41751 | -.07240 | 1.63542 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.843 | 25.775 | .077 | .78151 | .42406 | -.09053 | 1.65355 |
| Total Score | Equal variances assumed | 3.252 | .082 | 2.484 | 29 | .019 | 5.11975 | 2.06101 | .90451 | 9.33499 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.404 | 22.883 | .025 | 5.11975 | 2.12971 | .71287 | 9.52663 |

No significant difference was found between communicative performances of these two groups of children. In other words, there was not any significant difference between children whose mothers were below 35 and those who had above 35-year-old mothers (Tables 5 & 6).

**Table 5.** Group statistics

| | Mother's age | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fluency and Coherence | 25-35 years old | 12 | 16.5833 | 1.52007 | .43881 |
| | 35-70 years old | 19 | 16.8421 | 1.22534 | .28111 |
| Accuracy and Grammatical Range | 25-35 years old | 12 | 16.7083 | 1.75108 | .50549 |
| | 35-70 years old | 19 | 16.8421 | 1.64192 | .37668 |
| Lexical Resources | 25-35 years old | 12 | 16.6667 | 1.41956 | .40979 |
| | 35-70 years old | 19 | 16.7895 | 1.27275 | .29199 |
| Pronunciation | 25-35 years old | 12 | 16.9583 | 1.23322 | .35600 |
| | 35-70 years old | 19 | 16.7895 | 1.38760 | .31834 |
| Discoursal and Pragmatic Features | 25-35 years old | 12 | 16.3750 | 1.11038 | .32054 |
| | 35-70 years old | 19 | 16.5789 | 1.28304 | .29435 |
| Total Score | 25-35 years old | 12 | 83.2917 | 6.04701 | 1.74562 |
| | 35-70 years old | 19 | 83.8421 | 6.42273 | 1.47348 |

**Table 6.** Independent-samples t-test

| | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |

| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fluency and Coherence | Equal variances assumed | .023 | .882 | -.522 | 29 | .606 | -.25877 | .49586 | -1.27292 | .75537 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.497 | 19.840 | .625 | -.25877 | .52113 | -1.34639 | .82885 |
| Accuracy and Grammatical Range | Equal variances assumed | .082 | .777 | -.215 | 29 | .831 | -.13377 | .62101 | -1.40387 | 1.13633 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.212 | 22.389 | .834 | -.13377 | .63041 | -1.43984 | 1.17230 |
| Lexical Resources | Equal variances assumed | .019 | .891 | -.250 | 29 | .804 | -.12281 | .49054 | -1.12608 | .88047 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.244 | 21.602 | .809 | -.12281 | .50318 | -1.16745 | .92183 |
| Pronunciation | Equal variances assumed | .424 | .520 | .344 | 29 | .733 | .16886 | .49084 | -.83502 | 1.17274 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | .354 | 25.616 | .727 | .16886 | .47757 | -.81352 | 1.15124 |
| Discoursal and Pragmatic Features | Equal variances assumed | .564 | .459 | -.453 | 29 | .654 | -.20395 | .45001 | -1.12433 | .71644 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.469 | 26.053 | .643 | -.20395 | .43519 | -1.09840 | .69051 |
| Total Score | Equal variances assumed | .453 | .506 | -.238 | 29 | .814 | -.55044 | 2.31671 | -5.28863 | 4.18776 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.241 | 24.621 | .812 | -.55044 | 2.28436 | -5.25885 | 4.15797 |

As for the last research question concerning the effects of children's birth order on their communicative performance development, analyses of results demonstrated a significant difference (sig. =.009) in the pronunciation of first children compared to that of second kids. Tables 7

and 8 clearly indicate that first children (M= 17.46) pronounced the words much more appropriately than second children (M=16.28).

**Table 7.** Group statistics

| | Child | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fluency and Coherence | First | 15 | 16.9333 | 1.57963 | .40786 |
| | Second | 16 | 16.5625 | 1.06262 | .26566 |
| Accuracy and Grammatical Range | First | 15 | 17.1333 | 1.99523 | .51517 |
| | Second | 16 | 16.4688 | 1.24457 | .31114 |
| Lexical Resources | First | 15 | 16.9667 | 1.50555 | .38873 |
| | Second | 16 | 16.5313 | 1.10255 | .27564 |
| Pronunciation | First | 15 | 17.4667 | 1.04312 | .26933 |
| | Second | 16 | 16.2813 | 1.30344 | .32586 |
| Discoursal and Pragmatic Features | First | 15 | 16.7667 | 1.33452 | .34457 |
| | Second | 16 | 16.2500 | 1.04881 | .26220 |
| Total Score | First | 15 | 85.2667 | 6.68919 | 1.72714 |
| | Second | 16 | 82.0938 | 5.43206 | 1.35802 |

**Table 8.** Independent-samples t-Test

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Fluency and Coherence | Equal variances assumed | .487 | .491 | .772 | 29 | .447 | .37083 | .48066 | -.61223 | 1.35389 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | .762 | 24.314 | .453 | .37083 | .48675 | -.63308 | 1.37474 |
| Accuracy and Grammatical Range | Equal variances assumed | 1.031 | .318 | 1.121 | 29 | .272 | .66458 | .59306 | -.54837 | 1.87753 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.104 | 23.196 | .281 | .66458 | .60184 | -.57983 | 1.90899 |
| Lexical Resources | Equal variances | .133 | .718 | .923 | 29 | .364 | .43542 | .47176 | -.52944 | 1.40027 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | assumed | | | | | | | | | |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | .914 | 25.581 | .369 | .43542 | .47654 | -.54490 | 1.41573 |
| Pronunciation | Equal variances assumed | 1.322 | .260 | 2.784 | 29 | .009 | 1.18542 | .42586 | .31443 | 2.05640 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.804 | 28.329 | .009 | 1.18542 | .42276 | .31989 | 2.05094 |
| Discoursal and Pragmatic Features | Equal variances assumed | .335 | .567 | 1.203 | 29 | .239 | .51667 | .42959 | -.36194 | 1.39527 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.193 | 26.587 | .243 | .51667 | .43299 | -.37240 | 1.40573 |
| Total Score | Equal variances assumed | .022 | .883 | 1.454 | 29 | .157 | 3.17292 | 2.18210 | -1.28997 | 7.63580 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.444 | 27.022 | .160 | 3.17292 | 2.19709 | -1.33498 | 7.68081 |

## 6. Discussion and Conclusion

The results of the present study demonstrated that there was a difference between the pronunciation of children whose mothers' education level was above diploma and that of children whose mothers were below diploma, and that the first group had much better pronunciation compared to the second group. As a consequence, the results of the study, to some extent, support the findings of the study done by Hart & Risely (1995), Hoff (2006), Hoff, Laursen and Tardif (2002), and Hoff-Gingsberg (1998) who concluded that children's advanced language development is linked to mothers' education level owing to highly-educated mothers' inclination to have more and better interaction with their children in comparison with less educated mothers. Moreover, as expected by the researchers of this study, the more highly-educated mothers are , the wider range of vocabulary and the better pronunciation they have which surely influences children's

communicative performance in general and their pronunciation in particular.

Further, a significant difference between the total communicative performance as well as fluency and coherence, accuracy and grammatical range and lexical resources of working mothers' children and those of unemployed mothers was found. Simply put, working mothers' children outperformed non-working mothers' kids in this regard. In other words, it was found that mothers' employment had impacts on the total children's communicative performance, and their fluency, accuracy and vocabulary resources. The results of the study seems quite reasonable inasmuch as the first group, i.e., working mothers' kids learned communication and sociability from their mothers whose jobs required them to have more social communication with their clients, colleagues, etc. compared to unemployed mothers. Also, employed mothers were more likely to have tendency to bring up sociable kids through paying more attention to their fluency, accuracy and other language skills.

According to the results of the study, mothers' age had no significant effects on children's communicative performance. In other words, there was no significant difference in the communicative performance of preschoolers whose mothers were below 35 and those with above 35-year-old mothers. In this regard, it can be argued that in spite of the role of mothers' age in their motivation to boost up their kids' communicative performance, other environmental, social and individual factors have more crucial and dominant impacts on this process.

Besides, the analysis of results revealed that children's birth order influenced their pronunciation skills and that first-born children had better pronunciation skills than second kids which seems quite logical because first children are the center of their mothers' attention and their mothers are inclined to pay more attention to the details of their kids' language learning process and especially their pronunciation. In other words, first children's mothers have more tendencies to provide their children with language input in the first place and correct their children's output and give them feedback in the second place in comparison with mothers of later-born children. In addition, the results of the current research to some extent support the results of research

conducted by Bornstein, Leach and Haynes (2004) as well as those obtained by Hoff-Gingsberg (1998) who made a conclusion that first-born children outperformed later-born children regarding language skill development process.

## References

[1] Ahmeduzzaman, M., & Roopnarine, J.L. (1992). Sociodemographic factors, functioning style, social support, and fathers involvement with preschoolers in African-American families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54*, 699–707.

[2] Amato, P.R. (1998). More than money? Men's contributions to their children's lives. In A. Booth & A.C. Crouter (Eds.), *Men in families: When do they get involved? What difference does it make?* (pp. 241–278). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum..

[3] Bornstein, M.H., Leach, D.B., & Haynes, O.M. (2004). Vocabulary competence in first-and second born siblings of the same chronological age. *Journal of Child Language, 31*, 855–873.

[4] Cabrera, N.J., Tamis-LeMonda, C.S., Bradley, R.H., Hofferth, S., Lamb, M.E. (2000). Fatherhood in the twenty-first century. *Child Development*, *71*, 127–136.

[5] Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology.* 94, 95–120.

[6] Coley, R.L., & Chase-Lansdale, P.L. (1999). Stability and change in paternal involvement among urban African American fathers. *Journal of Family Psychology. 13*,416–435.

[7] Evans, G.W. (2004). The environment of childhood poverty. *American Psychologist*, *59*(2), 77.

[8] Gavin, L. E., Black, M. M., Minor, S., Abel, Y., Papas, M. A., & Bentley, M. E. (2002). Young, disadvantaged fathers' involvement with their infants: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *31*(3), 266-276.

[9] Hart, B., & Risley, T. *(*1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children.* Baltimore: Brookes.

[10] Hoff, E. (2006). How social contexts support and shape language development. *Developmental Review. 26*, 55–88.

[11] Hoff, E. (2009). *Language development.* Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing.

[12] Hoff, E., Laursen, B., & Tardif, T. (2002). Socioeconomic status and parenting. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting (Vol. 2): Biology and ecology of parenting* (pp. 231–252). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

[13] Hoff-Ginsberg, E. (1991). Mother-child conversation in different social classes and communicative settings. *Child Development, 62*, 782–796.

[14] Hoff-Ginsberg, E. (1998).The relation of birth order and socioeconomic status to children‘s language experience and language development. *Applied Psycholinguistics,19*, 603–629.

[15] Kagan, J. & Tulkin, S. R. (1972). Mother-Child interaction: In the first year of life. *Child Development, 43(1),* 31-41.

[16] Laible, D. (2004).Mother-child discourse in two contexts: Links with child temperament, attachment security, and socio-emotional competence. *Developmental Psychology, 40*, 979–992.

[17] Lewis, K. (1999). Maternal style in reminiscing: Relations to child individual differences. *Cognitive Development*, 14, 381–399.

[18] Lewis, M., & Wilson, C. D. (1972). Infant development in lower class American families. *Human Development, 15*(2), 112-127.

[19] Mac Whinney, B. (2002). The gradual evolution of language. In Malle, B., & Givon, T. (Eds.), *The evolution of language* (pp. 234-264). Philadelphia: Benjamins.

*[20]* Mowder, B.A. (1997).Typical infant development. In A, Widerstrom, B. Mowder, S. Sandall (Eds.), *Infant development and risk.* (pp. 25–60). Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes.

[21] Pancsofar, N., & Vernon-Feagans, L. (2010).Fathers' early contributions to children's language development in families from

low-income rural communities. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *25*(4), 450–463.

[22] Shonkoff, J., & Phillips, D. (2000). *From neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development.* Washington, D.C: National Academy Press.

[23] Vernon-Feagans, L., Pancsofar, N., Willoughby, M., Odom, E., Quade, A., Cox, M. (2008). Predictors of maternal language to infants during a picture book task in the home: Family SES, child characteristics and the parenting environment. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 29, 213–226.

[24] Yogman, M.W., Kindlonher, D., & Earls, F. (1995). Father involvement and cognitive/behavioral outcomes of preterm infants. *Journal of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *34*, 58–66.