



Approaches and Models in Special Education and Rehabilitation



Belgrade 2020.

Approaches and Models in Special Education and Rehabilitation

THEMATIC COLLECTION OF INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE

Belgrade, 2020

Approaches and Models in Special Education and Rehabilitation
Thematic Collection of International Importance

Publisher

University of Belgrade – Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation
Publishing Center of the Faculty

For publisher

PhD Snežana Nikolić, Dean

Editors

PhD Goran Nedović, Professor
PhD Fadilj Eminović, Professor

Reviewers

PhD Danijela Ilić-Stošović, Professor, University of Belgrade – Faculty of
Special Education and Rehabilitation
PhD Dragan Marinković, Associate Professor, University of Belgrade –
Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation
PhD Siniša Ristić, Professor, University of East Sarajevo, Faculty of Medicine
Foča, Bosnia and Herzegovina
PhD Bryan McCormick, Professor, Temple University, College of Public
Health, United States of America

Cover design

Boris Petrović, MA

Technical Editor

Biljana Krasić

Proceedings will be published in electronic format CD.

Circulation 150

ISBN 978-86-6203-139-6

By decision no. 3/9 from March, 8th 2008. The Teaching and Research Council of the University of Belgrade – Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation initiated Edition: Monographs and papers.

By decision no. 3/63 from June, 30th 2020. The Teaching and Research Council of the University of Belgrade – Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation has given approval for the printing of Thematic Collection "Approaches and Models in Special Education and Rehabilitation".

ANALYSIS OF PRAGMATIC ABILITIES IN SCHOOL CHILDREN

Jadranka Otašević¹ & Gordana Čolić²

¹University of Belgrade, Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation, Belgrade, Serbia

²College of Social Work, Belgrade, Serbia

SUMMARY

Communicative functions are abstract units that reflect the speaker's communicative intent. They involve motivation, aims and objectives that one wishes to achieve by communicating with other. Conversational abilities refer to the subject's capacity for participating on an interactive sequence of speech acts which aims the communicative interchange. Pragmatic language ability refers to the ability to use language in a social context. Methods: participants of this study were 40 children, with ages between 7 and 12 years, who attended primary school. The aim of this research was to investigate pragmatic ability in school age children and to compare pragmatic abilities in relation to age, intelligence and social experience. For testing, we used the Test of Pragmatic Language-TOPL (Diana Phelps -Terasaki & Phelps-Gunn Trisha). Results: The results showed that the intelligence quotient is directly related to the achievements of the pragmatic language test, there are significant differences in the achievements of children in relation to the education of their parents too. Conclusion: these results confirm the assumption of intelligence as basic ability and relatively reliable predictive factor in the development of pragmatic skills as well as the children whose parents have higher education have more stimulating speech and language backgrounds and diverse cultural-sociological models of communication.

Key words: Children, pragmatic abilities, communication, language development

INTRODUCTION

Children vary in their ability to use language in social contexts and this has important consequences for wellbeing (Matthews, 2018). The main function of a language, which was defined by Ferdinand de Saussure, is the communicative function. There is constant interaction of language and social context. Since its birth, the child is surrounded by speech, mainly by speech that adults refer to each other or to the child, which means not monologue but dialogue. In the frame of very complicated social interaction, which can be verbal or nonverbal, the child begins to develop communicative skills. Child is confronted with a very complex task: on the one hand to take control of the language system, to develop linguistic ability, competency and on the other hand through social interaction to get involved in acquiring communicative competency. The child from the earliest period of life tends to master linguistic and sociolinguistic rules (Jocić, 2006). Sociolinguistic approach to the study of language has led to the emergence of new terms or new meanings of communicative competence of the speaker and the listener. Emphasizing the need to access the language in which socio-cultural factors have an explicit and constitutional role, linguist Del Hymes created the term communicative

competence. Such competence are important in adult-child relations, qualifying children as interactional competent students in educational settings, and play a significant role in shaping children's written literacy skills.

Apart from learning the structure and the meaning of its mother tongue, a child must learn the terms of use of that particular language and verbal behaviour. In contrast to the Chomsky's competence of generative grammar, Hymes's social linguistic term has a broader meaning: it includes both, linguistic and sociological aspects, as to it refers to the knowledge of the structure and rules of a language and also to the awareness of using those rules in speaking and understanding, the rules of use without which grammatical rules would be useless (Jocić, 2006). Chomsky sharply separates basic language ability (competence) from its concrete manifestation in speech activities (performance). Fundamental and quite a sharp distinction between language skills and speech activities and the theoretical primacy of the first are important definitions of generative grammar in its present form. Original terms that were introduced by Chomsky are competence and performance. Alternative terminological opposition in the Serbian language could be knowledge - demonstration. It is important to understand that the ability is not a skill, because it would then be in the range of active.

Under the ability, on the contrary, it is essential to understand the power of producing and understanding of the statement in the native language that the speaker, possesses where the ability in short means what someone knows, even if it is largely unconsciously and the activity is what he does with it. Speaking activity (the use of language in communication) is the direct response of language ability (the knowledge of the language that the speaker-listener possesses). In order to study the speaking activity we should consider the combined effects of a whole variety of factors, amongst the language, ability of speaker-listener, etc. Children's communicative use of language allows them to respond to and to solicit further speech, thus organizing social interaction as adjacent responsive and reactive verbal actions that serve as the building blocks of conversation and inter subjectivity.

Communication and Language competence

Humans make relatively rapid progress in developing acquiring and building up the intellectual and creative abilities thanks to linguistic abilities, i.e. privilege to be able to possess, develop, and use such a perfect tool for communication as language is. Language ability is manifested in two forms. The first is a system of units and rules, which the representatives of a group must master in order to be able to communicate with each other (to communicate through language). This kind of manifestation of general language abilities can be called linguistic knowledge or language competency. Knowledge of a language cannot be inherited, therefore it is not congenital, congenital is only the language ability, and in other words congenital are predispositions for language. Language knowledge means, knowing the units of the language on all levels, but also knowing the rules for combining the language units. However we should not forget (but it is often forgotten) that the language would not work if it does not include the rules of selection and rules of language use due to the situational context. Therefore, there are two types of linguistic knowledge or language skills a) knowledge competencies code

(language system) and b) the knowledge, communication skills (implementation, using the language system). The second round of general expression of language skills is the use of language, i.e. use of linguistic knowledge or linguistic competence.

Language is one of the determining factors of general development of the child and as such, it is often the subject of scientific studies. It is very hard to mark off biological, logistic, psychological, social anthropological course in studying speech and language development. Interdisciplinary is the approach, which connects recent theoretical and research orientation. This conception is particularly present in pragmatic development (Barriga Villanueva, Ninio, & Snow 1996). Developmental pragmatics in this section is interpreted as a field of study lying (placed) between linguistics and the social development without sharply defined borders. In this part, the pragmatic development is understood as a heterogeneous area. These authors agree with Vygotsky's theoretical orientation, by which speech and language are developed in communication. The theoretical basis from which above mentioned authors start is the interactive contextually oriented model of behaviour and development of speech in which the child is seen not only as a passive receiver from the outside but also as an active one in interpersonal meeting at which the meaning of behaviour is constructed by the (Barriga Villanueva et al., 1996). For Luria, child's communication with adults is the elementary form of living activity in which the whole child's development takes place.

The development of communication is a process of interchanging quality-specific forms of communicative activity. That process has its motives, needs, specific operations and communication. The motivation to understand self and others takes different forms with different goals at the various stages of development. At each stage of development the content of communication that attracts a child to an adult changes in such a way that it provides the child with sustained adult attention (Grigorenko et al. 1997). This attention is necessary for a child to be able to solve tasks specific for his age. Lisina described for stages in the development of children's communication:

1. The need for adults attention and benevolence (from two to six months of age).
2. The need for joint activity and adults participation (from six months to three years of age).
3. The need for respect (from three years to six years of age).
4. The need for understanding and shared experience (from five to seven years of age).

This author thinks that main importance in development is situational practical communication because it is interposed by actions of language development. The development of communication (in ontogenetically sense) is started by effectual, through practical-situational, till symbolical or semiotic (Ivić, 1994). The child starts contact with its social environment first with nonverbal signs (smiles, cooing crying). The adults receive, understand and react to those signs. Based on effectual, dialectical communication adult-child (the language of sentiments), and the practical-situational, nonverbal communication (the language of actions) is developed through mutual activity of the adult and the child. Through these phases, the adults use the language, which is cut for a child, simple words, and combination of words, slow-paced speech, and a lot of repetition (speaking to a child is highly redundant). Adult speech is a translation of action into verbal plan, which allows the child gradually to learn the meaning of the

words. Socially- affective relations and joint activities of children and adults are the foundation of all subsequent forms of communication (Gopnik, Meltzoff, & Kuhl, 2003). Language development is the result of the integrated developed achievements in three different areas: conceptual, linguistic and social.

Pragmatic competence

Pragmatic ability can be defined as a part of communicative competence. Linguistic competence refers to the use of language in phonology, morphology, syntaxes and semantics as in receiving (the coming information, which can be heard, or read) also in expressing spoken or written information. For example, a person can show linguistic ability to use different forms that are semantically and syntactically correct, but that person does not identify the right moment when those construction should be used in a most efficient and most acceptable way. On the other hand, communicative competence includes pragmatically knowledge and consciousness when in the most efficient are certain linguistic constructions used. Linguistic/language competence refers to the language through phonology morphology syntax semantics but it does not refer to the pragmatics dimension of the language. Accurate use of formal syntactic structures and semantics do not always provide good communication, because the communication should take into account situational, social and linguistic context. Bishop (2001) emphasise that language ability is necessary condition for communicative competence, but not the only one. Children, even when they do not fully understand the language, rely on contextual and non-verbal elements in order to understand the intention of interlocutor (Ivšac & Gacina, 2006). Understanding of our own intentions and also the intentions of an interlocutor is explained by social cognition whose importance for conversation and communication is advocated by numerous authors (Bishop, 2002).

In pragmatic studies, definitions of pragmatics and study frameworks vary quite widely, which may be due to the multidisciplinary nature of pragmatics. According to the American Speech and Hearing Association (American Speech and Hearing Association – ASHA, 2005) the pragmatics of the language used in social interactions includes three communication skills. The first one is the use of language for different purposes such as greetings, giving information, asking for information, requests, and promises. The second one is adjusting the language to the requirements of the situation or interlocutor (we address in a different way a child as compared to an adult, we give enough information to someone who is under-informed, a place where we are also affect our communication). The third one is the respect of the rules of conversation (rules relating to the exchange in the conversation, stick to the topic primarily initiated, introduction of new topics of conversation, behaviour during misunderstandings). There are rules for using nonverbal signs in communication such as: the distance between the interlocutors, facial expressions, and eye contact. The rules are determined by particular culture and language. Pragmatics relates to the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker - pragmatics analyses what people mean under the expression they use rather than what the words or phrases in those expressions might mean by themselves. Pragmatics studies the contextual meaning - in other words, how a speaker organizes what he/she wants to say in accordance with whom he/she is talking to, where, when and under what

circumstances. Pragmatics studies how the context affects what is said. Pragmatics studies the invisible meaning, in other words, it explores how more is communicated than it is said - how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated. Pragmatics deals with relative distance, concerning closeness (physical, social, conceptual). Depending on how close the listener is, the speaker determines how much is needed to be said. Great lack of research and evaluation of pragmatics itself is the inability of an objective and consistent analysis of its concepts (Yule, 2002). Pragmatic ability can be defined as communicative competence. Linguistic competence refers to the use of language in phonology, morphology, syntaxes and semantics both in receiving (the information received, which can be heard, or read) and in expressing spoken or written information. For example, a person can show linguistic ability to use different forms that are semantically and syntactically correct, but this person does not identify the right moment when such syntax should be used in the most efficient and most acceptable way. On the other hand, communicative competence includes pragmatic knowledge and awareness of the best time for the most efficient use of certain syntax constructions. Cognitive knowledge, linguistic knowledge, and social knowledge in the interaction are prerequisites of effective communication. Communicative competence depends on many skill, factors, abilities, the overlapping factors, and they are often abstract. Linguistic/language competence refers to the language, i.e. phonology, morphology, syntaxes, semantics, however, it does not refer to the pragmatic dimension of the language. Accurate use of formal syntax and semantics do not always provide good communication, because the communication should take into account situational, social and linguistic context. Communicative competence refers to the use of social rules of language and includes the pragmatic knowledge and awareness. The development of a certain level of a language system, preserved processing system with access to a rich knowledge base, ability to understand and analyze the thoughts and actions of other people are the prerequisites for the development and implementation of pragmatic competence. Bishop (2001) emphasizes that language ability is necessary condition for communicative competence, but not the only one. Children, even when they do not understand the language completely, rely on contextual and non-verbal elements in order to understand the intention of interlocutor. Pragmatic ability involves the development of language system, cognitive development, memory capacity, reasoning ability, integration of information while following the intention of the interlocutor, prior knowledge about the world (experience) (Van der Lely, 2003).

Pragmatics refers to how to language is used in context to a range of purposes. Pragmatics is constrained by sets of rules, like other levels of language. There are rules how to initiate, regulate and terminate conversations.

The development of pragmatic ability

The study of child pragmatic development is a heterogeneous field that brings together linguistic pragmatics and child development, and encompasses different traditions and theoretical perspectives on language and social interaction.

The earliest children's language activity is speech act. Already in the first year of age before the appearance of the first word children use intonational forms. With ten

months children show by hand what they want, they express intentions by gesture, and later they verbally express such intentions. When the child utters his first words he already has intonational forms by which he carries out intentions (positive and negative feelings, identification of objects, requests, statements). These acts are carried out in direct context. By the age of three children use statements, in other words requests in imperative mood (Give juice). Between the age of three and six, the children use less direct forms. (May I have the juice). At the age of six the children develop and use indirect speech acts (Delahunty & Garvey, 1997). Basic conversation, taking the role of listener and speaker appears very early, at the age of three months. When a mother speaks to the child, the child turns his head and replies by intonation, by facial expression and vocalisation. The child even understands when the speech is not addressed to him. Through the period of two words stage, expectations are raised to the level of verbal response. Mother gives the child conversational support through the following models:

- a) dialogue (M-where is the ball?, C-raises ball, M- there is the ball),
- b) expanding (C-rabbit, M-rabbit likes to eat salad, will you give him a little?),
- c) encouragement (M-what did you see?, C-silence, M- you saw what?).

Introduction and development of the topic is possible only if the topic relates to the familiar objects and events and is encouraged by adults. Children at the age of three with their peers rarely start the topic, if they start the choice is random and the change of topic is common (Delahunty & Garvey, 1997). Children between the second and fifth year in taking over the role of speaker and listener make a long pause. Coherence, in other words logical connection between statements from the one that proceeded is in connection with the cohesive markers or aids (anaphoric replacement, noun, ellipsis conjunction, repetition, and substitution). The most significant increase in the use of this form is at the age of five. Child's ability to tell the story develops at the age of three. The stories are simple, involving the personal experience, with very little information, but with characters, events and actions. Reasoning ability is developed only at the age of five, six and seven. At the age of eight and nine children develop the ability of the transferred meaning, this ability appears much earlier, at the age of three, but the meanings are related to the physical quality (e.g. high as an elephant). Over time, children learn the lexicocommunicative and pragmatic means that enable full verbal and situational sensitive realization of previously acquired communicative intents such as justifications, promises, prohibitions, challenges, apologies, explanations, refusals, and disagreements. Approximately from the age of seven children develop a wide repertoire of creative interactive language activities, learn jokes, riddles, to insult one another, to maintain group identity. Studies on the conversations of young children show that many interactive capabilities are already present before starting school.

METHOD

The subject of this research is pragmatic ability in children in primary school. The aim of the research is to investigate pragmatic ability in children and to compare pragmatic abilities in relation to age, intelligence and social experience. The hypothesis of this research is based on that pragmatic ability depends on intelligence, age and social experience.

Sample and Instrument

The sample consisted of 40 school children, 7 to 12 years old, who attend primary school Cyril and Methodius in Belgrade. Only children with IQ- 90 and over 90 are included in the sample (the data on IQ are from the database of the school psychologist). Children were individually tested. For the testing, we used the Test of Pragmatic Language-TOPL (Diana Phelps-Terasaki & Phelps-Gunn Trisha). TOPL consists of 44 questions which the examiner asks (reads), and the examinee answers to them. There are pictures for all items (44). Narratives and story contexts revolve around natural every-day communicative and social interactions. The main objective of this test is to use a comprehensive understanding of the pragmatics or social language skills on the tested population. Test items were grouped into six core components of pragmatic abilities: physical setting, audience, topics, purpose (speech act), visual-gestural cues, and abstraction. The basis of this research is descriptive method and correlation analysis.

Statistical methods

The basis of this research is descriptive method and correlation analysis. Statistical parameter and nonparametric methods were used. The statistical data processing used the following statistical measures and procedures: frequencies and percentages, ratings, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, chi-square and its significance, Pearson's linear correlation coefficient and its significance.

RESULTS

Children's achievements on the test assessing pragmatic abilities were expressed in three forms: raw score, percentage, age equivalent.

Table 1. Results on the Test of Pragmatic Language

Pragmatic	M	Std	Min	Max
raw score	35.67	4.576	30	44
%	54.95	28.408	11	96
age equivalent	8	3.370	1	11

Legend: 1-results at the age level; 8-results above the age level, 6 months higher; 11-results above the age level, 24 months higher

The *Table 1* shows that this age children in primary school, on average, successfully solve 54.95% of the test. The raw score was 35.67 (possible maximum 44). As regards the minimum and maximum achievements, there are children who had the maximum number of points - 44 - on the test. As regards age equivalents, pragmatic ability of children in primary school is above average, equivalent to the children who are 6 months older.

Table 2. Results of the Test of Pragmatic Language / components

Components	N	M	Std	Min	Max
physical setting	40	8.88	0.335	8	9
Audience	40	9.08	0.997	7	10
Topics	40	6.78	1.097	4	8
speech act	40	6.50	1.155	4	8
visual-gestural cues	40	3.13	1.925	0	6
Abstraction	40	1.35	0.864	0	3

Table 2 shows the results of primary school children's achievements for each component individually. With regard to the lowest achievements at two sub-tests, abstraction and visual-gestural cues were the hardest for children of this sample (there are children that did not win a single point). The children made the best results at first and second sub-tests, physical setting and audience, which is indicated by high average achievements and low standard deviations (*Table 2*).

Intelligence

The lowest intelligence quotient is 90, and the highest is 125. The average intelligence quotient is 104.58. We formed three groups of children in relation to intelligence (1st group: IQ 90-100; 2nd: IQ 101-110 and 3rd: IQ 111-125). The lowest achievements on the pragmatic language test have children from the first group, i.e. children with IQ of 90-100.

Table 3. IQ and achievement on the Test of Pragmatic Language / components

Components	IQ	N	Mean Rank
Physical setting	1.group	15	16.33
	2.group	11	23.00
	3.group	14	23.00
Audience	1.group	15	13.90
	2.group	11	20.09
	3.group	14	27.89
Topics	1.group	15	14.13
	2.group	11	19.32
	3.group	14	28.25
Speech act	1.group	15	15.60
	2.group	11	17.09
	3.group	14	28.43
Visual-gestural cues	1.group	15	13.07
	2.group	11	18.55
	3.group	14	30.00
Abstraction	1.group	15	17.07
	2.group	11	18.55
	3.group	14	25.71

Table 4. *Statistical significance*

	Physical setting	Audience	Topics	Speech act	Visual-gestural cues	Abstraction
h^2	9.243	11.342	11.192	10.599	16.593	5.138
df	2	2	2	2	2	2
p	0.010	0.003	0.004	0.005	0.000	0.077

In this research, intelligence has proved to be an important factor of pragmatic competence. Table 4 indicates that IQ is important for all examined pragmatic language components, particularly for visual-gestural cues ($p < 0,001$; $h^2 = 16,593$), audience, topics, speech act.

The results show that the difference between the three groups is statistically significant. Achievements on the pragmatic language test are directly related to IQ. The level of intellectual functioning observed by intelligence quotient (IQ) of children examined proved to be a significant factor in all the examined variables. Children who are functioning at a higher intellectual level achieved significantly better results in all the investigated variables. The results showed that the intelligence quotient is directly related to the achievements of the pragmatic language test, namely, children from the third category, i.e. children with intelligence of 111-125 have the best achievements in all tested variables. We can conclude that these results confirm the assumption of intelligence as basic ability and relatively reliable predictive factor in the development of pragmatic abilities.

Age / Grades

Table 5. *Grades and achievement on the Test of Pragmatic Language*

Grades	M	Std	N
2.	67.40%	22.107	10
3.	41.40%	27.897	10
4.	61.70%	32.738	10
5.	49.30%	26.382	10
N	54.95%	28.408	40

Chi-Square 24.097, $p = 0.002$

Table 6. *Results achieved at the Test of Pragmatic Language, expressed in coefficients*

age		Coefficient			
		High	above average	average	below average
7	%	33.3	33.3	33.3	0
8	%	0	50.0	55.0	0
9	%	11.8	17.6	23.5	47.1
10	%	25.0	0	50.0	25.0
11	%	0	0	66.7	33.3
12	%	0	100	0	0
N	%	10.0	25.0	37.5	27.5

Table 6 shows the results achieved by the children aged 7 to 12. Seven-year old children are equally divided on the basis of their results in three categories (with high, average and above average results, each group containing about 33% of the children). What needs to be emphasised is that not a single child aged seven, eight and twelve had the results above average at the pragmatic language test. The majority of children who, according to their results, belong to the group of children below average, are nine-year old children (47%), then eleven-year old children (33.3%) and ten-year old children (25%). If we consider the results for the whole sample, then we may conclude that the majority of the children aged seven to twelve have achieved average results at the pragmatic language test (37.5%). The number of children with the results above average and below average is almost equal.

Parent education

Social experience of the child we watched through parent education. In this study better results on the Test of pragmatic Language to children whose parents have a higher education level. It is concluded that education of parents, is an important factor in child's pragmatic skill.

Table 7. *Test results on the pragmatic language and the education of parents*

Pragmatic	Group	average rank	Mann Whitney U	p
raw score	Secondary School degree	15.02	50.500	0.000
	University degree	29.63		
%	Secondary School degree	15.02	50.500	0.000
	University degree	29.63		
age equivalent	Secondary School degree	17.68	117.000	0.034
	University degree	25.20		

The socio-educational status of parents is assessed in this research. The results showed that there are significant differences in the achievements of children in relation to the education of their parents. The differences are significant on all scales and subscale (the majority of them is a level of significance of 0.001). Our research has shown that education of the mother is a very important factor in semantic and pragmatic skills of the child. The same showed for the education of the father.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Understanding a child's communication is one step towards understanding them as a whole child. Linguistic skills alone are not enough for successful communication. In communicative situations, listeners need to work out the meaning of a linguistic expression on the basis of the contextual factors of the situation and on the basis of their world knowledge and experiences (Leinonen & Tandefelt, 2007). Ability to answer pragmatically demanding questions is dependent on many developmental factors. However, because of the complex nature of communication, it is not possible to represent all factors affecting communication, which is why the focus here is only on some of

the basic factors. Sensory-motorical functions such as auditive and visual perception and articulatory ability make a ground for communication. Linguistic ability makes it possible to understand linguistic information that is uttered and formulate a verbal answer. Therefore, children's question answering is connected with their ability to deal with the linguistic structure of questions and ability to understand the meanings of words. However, in everyday communication situations linguistic skills are not enough since without cognitive abilities necessary for pragmatic understanding, utterance interpretation remains problematic.

The results showed that the intelligence quotient is directly related to the achievements of the pragmatic language test, children with intelligence of 111-125 have the best achievements. We can conclude that these results confirm the assumption of intelligence as basic ability and relatively reliable predictive factor in the development of pragmatic abilities. As regards the school age achievements, pragmatic language test does not indicate a continuous and a clear correlation of these two variables. School age has not proved as a significant factor when examining the pragmatic skills. There is a rise in achievements in the pragmatic language test of school children according to the increase of their school-age, but still we cannot talk about a stable and strong tendency.

The socio-educational status of parents is assessed in this study. The results showed that there are significant differences in the achievements of children in relation to the education of their parents. The differences are significant. Results showed that parent's education is an important factor in pragmatics ability. Our research has shown that education of mother is a very important factor in pragmatic ability of her child. The same has been noticed for the education of the father. These results are quite expected since the beginning of conversation occurs very early in the first mother-infant relation. Dore defined four types of communication relations that are important for conversational development: a) mother-child relationship, b) relationship with younger brother or sister, c) relationship with peers and d) pupil status relations. The interpretation of the results obtained in such manner will base on already presented view that biological factors determine the extent of possibility or impossibility, therefore, the limits outside which development is hard to imagine, and the social environment is responsible for realisation of the potential. As intelligence is at least partly dependant on heredity, it is logical that children of more educated parents and presumably more intelligent are themselves, more intelligent. Educated parents usually have high aspirations. In addition, they belong to higher socio-economic class of society so they are able to provide children with the necessary incentives for the full recognition of cognitive potential. It is likely that children whose parents have higher education, presumably of higher socio-economic class, have more stimulating speech and language backgrounds and diverse cultural-sociological models of communication.

Inference can be seen as a cognitive process to connect information from different sources. It is an especially important ability when deriving an implied meaning of an utterance, as shown by studies about text comprehension in children (Cain, 2001). Pragmatic ability is a developmentally long process to become fully aware of one's own processing in different situations and to be able to give a verbal explanation when it is asked for (Ryder & Leinonen, 2014).

The level of intellectual functioning observed in the study of intelligence quotient of children proved to be a significant factor in all the examined variables. We can conclude that these results confirm the assumption of intelligence as basic ability and relatively reliable predictive factor in the development of pragmatic skills. Observed through school age achievements pragmatic language test does not indicate a continuous and a clear correlation of these two variables. There is a rise in achievements in the pragmatic language test in children with dysgraphia language according to the increase of their school-age, but still cannot talk about a stable and strong tendency. Results showed that parent's education is an important factor in semantic and pragmatics skills. It is likely that children whose parents have higher education, we assume the higher socio-economic class have more stimulating speech and language backgrounds and diverse cultural-sociological models of communication.

Development of the language, communication and speech systems are depended on each other and inextricably interwoven into a child's general development. Knowledge of the rules that exist in speech, language and communication is implicit in children acquiring the language and in mature speakers (Buckley 2003).

REFERENCES

1. Barriga Villanueva, R., Ninio, A., & Snow, C.E. (1996). *Pragmatic development*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
2. Bishop, D.V.M., & Baird, G. (2001). Parent and teacher report of pragmatic aspects of communication. *Development Medicine and Child Neurology*, 43, 809-818.
3. Bishop, D.V.M., & Frazier Norbury, C. (2002). Exploring the borderlands of autistic disorder and specific language impairment: a study using standardized diagnostic instruments. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 43(7), 917-929.
4. Buckley, B. (2003). *Children's communication skills: from birth to five years*. Psychology Press.
5. Cain, K., Oakhill, J. V., Barnes, M. A., & Bryant, P. E. (2001). Comprehension skill, inference-making ability, and their relation to knowledge. *Memory & cognition*, 29(6), 850-859.
6. Delahunty, G., & Garvey, J. (1997). The development of language. *Colorado State University-English Department*.
7. Gopnik, A., Meltzoff, A.N., & Kuhl, P.K. (2003). *Znanstvenik u kolijevci: Šta nam rano učenje kazuje o umu*. Zagreb: Educa.
8. Grigorenko, E. L., Ruzgis, P., & Sternberg, R. J. (1997). *Psychology of Russia: Past, present, future*. Nova Publishers.
9. Ivić, M. (1994). *Pravci u lingvistici*. Beograd: SlovoGRAF.
10. Ivšac, J., & Gačina, A. (2006). Postoji li pragmatički jezični poremećaj? *Hrvatska revija za rehabilitacijska istraživanja*, 42(2), 15-29.
11. Jocić, M. (2006). *Jezik, komunikacija, razvoj*. DOO Dnevnik-novine i časopisi, Novi Sad.
12. Leinonen, T., & Tandefelt, M. (2007). Evidence of language loss in progress? Mother-tongue proficiency among students in Finland and Sweden. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 187/188, 185 - 204.
13. Matthews, D., Biney, H., & Abbot-Smith, K. (2018) Individual Differences in Children's Pragmatic Ability: A Review of Associations with Formal Language, Social Cognition, and Executive Functions. *Language Learning and Development*, 14(3), 186-223.

14. Ryder, N., & Leinonen, E. (2014). Pragmatic language development in language impaired and typically developing children: incorrect answers in context. *Journal of psycholinguistic research*, 43(1), 45-58.
15. Van der Lely, H. K. (2003). Do heterogeneous deficits require heterogeneous theories? SLI subgroups and the RDDR hypothesis. *Language competence across populations: Toward a definition of specific language impairment*, 109-133.
16. Yule, G. (2002). *Pragmatics*. Oxford. Introduction to Language Study. Oxford University Press.