

**Environmental and
psychosocial factors
contributing to language
delay in children under 5
years**

Name: Amira Abdelmagied

Module number: (ECEY5010)

Student number: 2416824

Word count: 4,250

I confirm that I have not presented any AI-generated text as my own work

I have used Grammarly to help with writing.

Section 1

Literature review

What is language development?

Language development represents one of the most remarkable achievements in early childhood. It involves progressing from preverbal communication to articulating sophisticated ideas, emotions, and desires using vocabulary and grammatical rules. This essential ability is key to children's cognitive growth, social interactions, and educational achievements (Kuhl, 2010; Law et al., 2017).

Language development in the early years is a complex journey with many interconnected parts. When young children experience language delays, the consequences can ripple through their development, affecting how they think and learn, their ability to connect with others, and their emotional health (Sunderajanand Kanhere, 2019). Language delay affects around 5-8% of pre-schoolers, marked by a noticeably slower progress in understanding and/or using language compared to other children their age. While some children will naturally catch up, early delays can also be a sign of more long-term language problems (McLaughlin, 2011, Norbury et.al, 2016).

. Identifying and addressing the causes of language delay is vital for early support and prevention. This assignment explores how environmental and psychosocial factors contribute to language delay in children under five, considering their interaction in various settings.

Understanding language delay: Contributing factors

A deep understanding of how environmental and social factors interact to cause these delays is vital for creating effective ways to help and support these children. Environmental and psychosocial factors intricately affect early years' language development. Key influences include socioeconomic status, parent-child interaction patterns, screen time, multilingual environments, parent mental health, and childcare quality. Understanding these factors provides a foundation for developing targeted interventions to prevent language delays and support optimal language development in young children (Sunderajanand Kanhere, 2019).

Environmental factors

Environmental factors significantly shape early language development.

Socioeconomic status is a strong predictor. According to Fernald et al. (2018), low-income children hear approximately 30 million fewer words by age three, causing substantial vocabulary gaps evident by 18 months and increasing over time. Low socioeconomic status children are 2.3 times more likely to experience language delays, even considering other factors.

Socioeconomic disadvantage, which includes limited resources, heightened stress, and decreased linguistic input, leads to a fountain of risk that affects language acquisition (Pace et al., 2017, Hart and Risley, 2003, Weisleder and Fernald, 2013).

High-quality language input and the amount of language a child hears are vital for language development. Child-directed speech, characterized by its clarity and relevance, aids children in effectively learning language patterns and maintaining engagement (Saint-Georges et al., 2013). In contrast, limited and unresponsive communication environments can impede language growth. Active conversations between parents and children benefit language acquisition and brain activity more than passive listening. Directive parenting may stifle language development, while descriptive language and questions encourage it. Direct interaction fosters vocabulary growth more effectively than overheard speech (Romeo et al., 2018, Rowe, 2018, Tamis-LeMonda, Kuchirko, and Song, 2014).

Media exposure serves as an additional environmental factor affecting language development. Research has established a negative relationship between increased screen time during early childhood and vocabulary development and expressive language skills (Madigan et al. 2020). The presence of background television adversely impacts the quantity and quality of parent-child interactions, potentially limiting opportunities for language learning. However, scaffolded viewing of high-quality educational media may positively influence specific aspects of language development (Kostyrka-Allchorne et al., 2017).

The process by which children acquire language while learning more than one language is complex and depends on various factors. While these children might initially have a smaller vocabulary in each specific language compared to children learning only one language, their overall word knowledge across all languages is

generally comparable. Significantly, research indicates that bilingualism itself is not a direct cause of language delay (Hoff et al., 2012). However, the challenge of accurately assessing multilingual children's language skills can result in the incorrect identification of language issues. In contrast, insufficient regular interaction with each language, or exposure to poor language, can hinder how well these children learn and use language (Annick De Houwer, 2015; Paradis et al., 2016; Bialystok, 2017; Annick De Houwer, 2018).

The physical world around children also influences how they learn language. Noise at home or school can make it harder for them to hear and understand (Evans and Green, 2018). This can lead to difficulties in distinguishing sounds and processing language, which might slow their language development. Moreover, living in crowded conditions can reduce opportunities for individual time with adults who promote language learning (Vernon-Feagans et al., 2012).

Psychosocial factors

Psychosocial factors strongly influence how young children learn language, particularly parental mental health and challenging family situations. Depressed mothers tend to interact verbally less with their children and demonstrate reduced sensitivity to their communication signals, which can also impair their thinking and language skills (Stein et al., 2014).

Family stress and negative childhood experiences can disrupt the normal way children learn language. Children who experience violence, abuse, or unstable family lives often face language delays, possibly because their interactions with caregivers are disrupted. Also, stress can affect their brains' development (Sylvestre, Bussieres and Bouchard, 2015; Cocydk and Duran, 2020; Cho Blair, Park and Kim, 2020; Salo et al., 2019). Furthermore, attachment security plays a vital psychosocial role in language development. Secure attachment relationships establish a basis for communication, where caregivers offer sensitive and supportive interactions that facilitate language acquisition. Children who form secure attachments tend to exhibit more developed language skills compared to their insecurely attached peers. The nature of parent-child interactions within secure attachments, including shared focus, pretend play, and reciprocal conversations, significantly influences language development (Van I Jzendoorn et al., 2007; Murray and Yingling, 2000).

High-quality childcare plays a crucial role in fostering early language development, with significant benefits observed, especially for children attending full-time programs. This type of care often involves consistent exposure to language and interactions with educators trained in early childhood development (Melhuish, Gardiner and Morris, 2017). Specifically, the presence of responsive caregivers who actively engage with children through conversation, storytelling, and asking questions, coupled with language-rich environments that offer a wide range of books, songs, and opportunities for communication, demonstrably enhances children's language acquisition. These essential elements work together to establish a stimulating setting, which in turn facilitates significant vocabulary growth and the development of complex sentence formation skills (Melhuish, Gardiner, and Morris, 2017).

Research shows that children who have experienced high-quality childcare tend to display more advanced language skills by the age of four, including a larger vocabulary, improved grammar, and enhanced communication abilities. Notably, these positive effects are especially pronounced for children from disadvantaged backgrounds, indicating that quality childcare can help reduce early language disparities (Melhuish, Gardiner and Morris, 2017, Perlman et al., 2019).

Future research should integrate various risk factors to create effective methods for predicting when children may experience language delays. This involves examining how all risks interact collectively, rather than in isolation, to gain insights into language development. Furthermore, studies aimed at helping need to closely investigate how modifying a child's environment and addressing their social-emotional well-being can enhance language development, especially for vulnerable children. This research will determine whether targeted interventions that alter these factors yield the most favourable language outcomes for at-risk children (Reilly, Morris, and Whyte, 2009).

Section 2

Methodology

Methodology Research approach

This section outlines the research approach for investigating environmental and psychosocial factors contributing to language delays in children under 5. The methodology is designed to capture nuanced experiential data from caregivers and professionals and measurable patterns of language development delays (Creswall and Plano Clark, 2018).

Because language learning is complex, a good research plan is needed to study how environmental and social factors affect language delay. Numbers can give us useful statistics, and stories can give us a detailed understanding. Therefore, this study will use numbers and stories to understand what causes language delay in young children fully. Using both helps the practitioners check the findings in different ways, making the results more solid and believable.

For example, the Early Language in Victoria Study followed approximately 1,900 children from infancy through early childhood to identify predictors and outcomes of early language delay (Reilly et al., 2018). Similarly, through its longitudinal approach, the Millennium Cohort Study has provided valuable insights into socioeconomic disparities in language development (Law et al., 2019).

Qualitative

Qualitative research often employs purposive sampling, selecting participants based on a shared relevant experience, or convenience sampling due to accessibility or cost. Another method is snowball sampling, in which initial participants refer others from their network. For example, one study specifically recruited pregnant women with epilepsy who were willing to be interviewed about their experience (Denny and Weckesser, 2022)

The qualitative phase of this study aims to understand the perspectives of parents, caregivers, and early childhood professionals regarding language development in children under five. This will provide practitioners with a nuanced understanding of

the social and environmental influences on language acquisition. By gathering stories through interviews, the study will uncover cultural, familial, and institutional factors that shape language development, insights that quantitative data alone may miss (Curry, Nembhard, and Bradley, 2019).

Quantitative

The quantitative components of this study will use standardized language assessments to evaluate children's language proficiency, collect demographic information, and measure relevant environmental variables. This systematic approach to data collection will enable statistical analysis aimed at determining the relationship between these identified factors and the observed language development outcomes in the children (Zhu et al., 2017).

Mixed Methods Approach

The adoption of a mixed-methods approach is particularly well-suited for investigating language delay. It acknowledges the complex, intricate interplay of biological, environmental, and psychosocial influences on early language acquisition. Moreover, this integrated design facilitates the triangulation of findings obtained through qualitative and quantitative methods, thereby enhancing the validity and reliability of the research conclusions (Almeida, 2018; Google Books, 2018).

Choosing participants

Carefully choosing participants is essential for reliable language delay research that can be applied broadly (Hulley et al., 2013).

Probability sampling, such as random, stratified, or cluster sampling, helps ensure that the study accurately represents a larger group, enabling more confident generalizations. However, these methods can be challenging when dealing with specific language-delayed populations. As a result, many studies resort to non-probability sampling methods, like convenience or purposive sampling, which, although less generalizable, provide a more flexible approach to studying these specific groups (Palinkas et al., 2015).

When deciding the number of child participants, practitioners must ensure sufficient statistical power to detect genuine effects while considering the factors influencing language delay. Sample size calculations should consider the anticipated impact of environmental and social factors (which may be small) and the planned data analysis, including subgroup analysis (Cunningham & McCrum-Gardner, 2007).

When selecting participants, practitioners will establish clear criteria to ensure a focused yet diverse group relevant to language delay. While they should exclude children with conditions such as neurodevelopmental disorders or hearing loss to concentrate on primary language delay, overly strict criteria could limit the study's real-world applicability, as children frequently experience multiple challenges (Reilly et al., 2014).

Recruitment methods

Recruitment methods are vital for minimizing bias and ensuring the reliability of studies. Research on language delay often overrepresents middle-class families (Fernald and Weisleder, 2015).

To achieve a more representative sample, practitioners should recruit from diverse community settings, collaborate with various services, and actively engage families at higher risk for language delays. This approach helps the study reflect a broader spectrum of children (Hammer and Weiss, 2000).

Data will be gathered through 45 - 60-minute semi-structured interviews with primary caregivers to explore their perspectives on their child's language development. This approach allows for an in-depth understanding of family and environmental influences. Interviews will be private, audio-recorded with consent, and transcribed. Topics will cover family communication, routines, screen time, reading, parental well-being, support access, and language perceptions. While rich data will be collected, the potential for socially desirable responses will be addressed by emphasizing the study's non-judgmental nature and the value of diverse experiences (Kallio et al., 2016).

For this study

This study will compare language development in 2- to 5-year-olds, including families from various income levels. The group will consist of equal numbers of children with and without language delays, excluding those with delays due to other health issues.

For the qualitative part, practitioners will interview 5-7 primary caregivers, hold a focus group with 3-5 early childhood educators, and interview 2-3 speech-language pathologists. The quantitative part will involve 10-20 child-caregivers for assessments and surveys. This sample size balances the need for basic statistical analysis with practical limits on time and money.

Interviews

Interviews are focused on conversation with a specific purpose: to gather evidence, data, or information, typically through an interviewer asking questions (r2.vlereader.com, n.d.).

Benefits

Interviews are a valuable tool for investigating the environmental and psychosocial factors involved in early language delay. They allow researchers to gather rich, contextual details about a child's home life and interactions, which can significantly impact their language development. Unlike quantitative methods, interviews can also capture complex psychosocial influences. Their flexibility enables the exploration of unexpected factors that may emerge during conversations. Moreover, interviews are accessible to a wide range of participants and help build a trusting relationship between researchers and those being interviewed, especially when discussing sensitive topics. Interviews are a useful way to study environmental and social factors in early language delay by collecting detailed information. Different types of interviews can be used (UNICFF UK,2022).

Types of interviews

Researchers categorize interviews in various ways: LeCompte and Preissle (1993) identify six types (standardized, in-depth, ethnographic, elite, life history, and focus groups). Bogdan and Biklen (1992) expand this list by including semi-structured and group interviews, while Lincoln and Guba (1985) add structured interviews. Oppenheim (1992) proposes an exploratory approach. Patton (1980) identifies four approaches (informal conversational, interview guide, standardized open-ended, and closed quantitative) (r2.vlereader.com, n.d.).

Semi-structured interviews: These follow a topic list but allow for flexibility. They are beneficial for this research because they ensure that key areas are addressed while letting parents share their own stories about their child's communication. This helps us compare families while understanding their unique situations (Uwtsd.ac.uk, 2025).

Unstructured interviews are informal, flexible conversations without a pre-set list of questions. They allow the interviewer to follow the flow of the conversation, explore emerging topics, and let the interviewee lead in discussing their experiences and perspectives in depth (Uwtsd.ac.uk, 2025).

Semi-structured interviews are recommended. They ensure key risk factors are addressed while providing the flexibility to explore individual family circumstances. This approach allows for comparable data collection alongside the potential for novel insights from both focused and open-ended inquiries. This research method is a good fit for studying language delay because:

- Language learning often occurs within families and through everyday interactions.
- Environmental factors that influence language can be subtle and context-dependent.
- Parents and caregivers understand a great deal about how their children communicate.
- Talking in person can be beneficial when discussing sensitive topics related to a child's development.
- It is difficult to measure aspects like family relationships and stress, which influence language, using standard tests (Uwtsd.ac.uk, 2025).

For this study

This study will employ semi-structured interviews with primary caregivers (45-60 minutes, covering 8-10 main topics) such as background, language history, environment, psychosocial factors, and resources, along with follow-up questions. Additionally, focus groups will be conducted with early childhood educators (60-90 minutes, including 5-8 core questions for discussion) and individual interviews with speech-language pathologists (30-45 minutes, featuring 5-10 targeted questions).

This multi-perspective approach aims to thoroughly explore the environmental and psychosocial factors contributing to language delay in children under five years.

weaknesses

Even though interviews are useful, they have some drawbacks in research:

- Interviews require significant time for planning, conducting, transcribing (writing down), and analysing the information.
- Interviewer bias: The interviewer's behaviour and characteristics may influence how participants respond to and interpret the research findings.
- Small sample size: Researchers often study fewer people because the interviews are in-depth.
- Inconsistent data: The manner in which interviewers pose questions and interpret the responses can vary, leading to less consistent results.
- Subjective reports: Interview data depends on individuals' statements, which may not always reflect a completely accurate picture of reality loss (Saidmamatov, O., Raximov, Q., Rodrigues, P., and Vasconcelos, O., 2022).

Semi-structured interviews present several risks to data integrity. They are less effective when conducted remotely on online platforms and encounter challenges with language barriers that can hinder probing. While technology is essential, it can compromise interview quality, and translation carries the risk of meaning loss

(Saidmamatov, O., Raximov, Q., Rodrigues, P., and Vasconcelos, O., 2022).

This research method is well-suited for studying language delay because:

- Language learning occurs frequently within families and everyday interactions.
- Factors in the environment that influence language can be minor and situation-dependent.
- Parents and caregivers understand a great deal about how their children communicate.
- Talking in person can be helpful when discussing sensitive topics related to a child's development.
- It is hard to measure aspects like family relationships and stress, which impact language, using standard tests (Oup.com, 2023).

observation

Observing involves closely watching and gathering facts directly from natural sources, which makes the information more reliable than second-hand accounts

(r2.vlereader.com, n.d., pp. 636- 637).

Direct observation is an effective method for studying how environmental and social factors impact young children's language. It allows researchers to see firsthand the interactions, surroundings, and behaviours that may be linked to language delays

(r2.vlereader.com).

Types of observation:

- Natural observation: Observing children in their natural settings (home, daycare, or playground) without any researcher intervention.
- Structured observation involves using a set plan or protocol to record specific actions or interactions (A., n.d.).

This study may observe children's language development in the following places:

- Homes: Understanding family communication patterns.
- Daycares and preschools: Observing how children communicate with peers and learn in groups.
- Therapy (with permission): To examine language use during therapy sessions.
- Community locations, such as library story time, provide opportunities to observe language in general social situations (A., n.d.).

This study will examine the environmental and social factors that may affect how children learn language:

- Caregiver-child interactions: the extent and quality of conversations between caregivers and children (including the complexity of language used and the level of engagement).
- Language stimulation: The frequency and methods of using activities that promote language, such as reading, singing, and talking.

- Screen time: The amount of time children spend viewing screens and the content they consume.
- Peer interactions: The frequency and quality of children's communication with their peers.
- Environmental stressors refer to any stressful elements in a child's surroundings, such as excessive noise or overcrowding.
- Emotional climate: The extent to which the environment feels supportive and responsive, and whether there is stress or tension.
- Cultural language practices include any unique linguistic habits from their culture, such as using multiple languages or sharing stories.
- Access to language resources: If resources such as books and educational toys are available to assist with language learning (Uwtsd.ac.uk, 2025).

For this study, employing both Natural and Structured Observation is optimal. Natural observation reveals fundamental interactions in typical settings. Structured observation utilizes plans to document specific behaviours consistently. This aids in understanding how environmental and social factors influence language delay.

Bias can skew the accuracy of studies on language development. Two important factors to consider are the Hawthorne effect and the halo effect.

The Hawthorne effect means people often change their actions when they know they are being watched.

According to his approach, the key steps for observation are:

- Gauge the person: understand the individual, their current mood, and openness.
- Non-threatening perception: feeling safe and not judging.
- Introduction: Introduce the individual and explain the process
- Establishing rapport: build trust and comfort.
- Relaxed signal with short, clear points: communicate calmly and clearly
- Link conversation to interest area: concentrate the study on their interests

(Oswald, Sherratt and Smith, 2014).

Paradis et al. (2021) underscore the importance of accounting for the Hawthorne effect in language development research using observational methods. Their work indicates that the typicality of parent-child interactions may be compromised when they are observed.

Although the Hawthorne effect is challenging to minimize, it can be diminished through repeated observations, diverse data collection methodologies, and unobtrusive techniques (McCambridge et al., 2014).

In this study on language delay in children, this could occur if:

- Parents observe and engage more with their children using language than they typically do.
- Children might perform better or worse on language activities simply because they are aware they are being tested.
- Caregivers may appear more involved and helpful when being observed than they typically are.

Halo effect

The Halo effect is a cognitive bias in which your overall feeling about someone can influence how you evaluate specific traits or behaviours. In this study, it may lead to less objective observations. For instance, observers might overestimate their language skills if a child is well-behaved. Conversely, if observers harbor negative feelings towards a family, they might unjustly attribute language delays to the environment. Likewise, if observers form a positive first impression of a family, they might assume that their interactions with their child are more effective than they truly are (Gabrieli et al., 2021).

Law et al. (2019) highlight the necessity for clinicians and researchers to consider the Halo effect during language development assessments. Their findings indicate that prior assumptions about a family's dynamics can inadvertently bias judgments regarding a child's language proficiency.

To address this potential bias:

- The study will use standard tests with clear scoring rules.

- Several individuals will observe the same interactions and provide their ratings. They will verify if their ratings are consistent.
- They will adhere to strict observation plans to ensure that everyone collects data consistently (Gabrieli et al., 2021).

Triangulation

Triangulation is an important research method that utilizes multiple data collection techniques to enhance research findings and increase their trustworthiness and reliability. It helps confirm results, reduces bias, provides a better overall perspective, and identifies inconsistencies. Common types include combining methods, using different data sources or times, employing multiple researchers, and applying various theories. When implementing triangulation, it is crucial to select complementary methods that address the research questions from diverse perspectives. This approach offers a strong justification for utilizing varied data sources (Denzin, 2012, Oswald, Sherratt and Smith, 2014).

For instance, if a study aims to understand children's outdoor engagement, it could utilize both online questionnaires and direct observations, enhancing the evidence (Denzin, 2012).

Key benefits

- Enhances the validity and reliability of data.
- Reduces bias from a single method.
- Provides a more comprehensive understanding.
- Highlights inconsistencies for further investigation (Google Books, 2018).

Section 3

Ethics

What are ethics?

At its core, ethics involves fundamental principles that guide our actions and decisions, aiming to protect the welfare, dignity, and rights of all participants. This is particularly critical in early childhood research because of the inherent vulnerability of young children and their families (Graham, 2015).

Research on environmental and psychosocial factors contributing to language delays in young children, especially those under five, requires robust ethical oversight due to participant vulnerability. This section outlines the moral framework for the study, which includes detailed procedures for informed consent, confidentiality, risk assessment and mitigation, and data handling. All protocols are designed to uphold the fundamental ethical principles of beneficence, non-maleficence, justice, and respect for autonomy (Beauchamp & Childress, 2019).

Ethics in early childhood involve more than just rules. They focus on creating an environment where children thrive. This entails respecting their dignity, rights, and independence, actively supporting their well-being and development, ensuring that all care and educational practices are fair and equitable, and holding educators and caregivers to high standards of professional responsibility and ethical decision-making (Burroughs, 2018).

Why are ethics important in early childhood research?

Ethics are crucial in early childhood research because young children are highly vulnerable. They often do not fully grasp what research involves and cannot provide proper consent. Additionally, there is a clear power imbalance between adult researchers and child participants. Therefore, research methods must always be developmentally appropriate for children's abilities. We must also safeguard their privacy, dignity, and safety rights. Early experiences, even in research, can significantly affect a child's development (Graham, 2015).

Ethics are crucial in early childhood for several reasons:

- Builds character: It establishes a moral foundation as children learn right from wrong through interactions (Kohlberg and Hersh, 1977).
- Forms identity: Ethical treatment supports children in developing self-worth and understanding their place in the world (Erikson, 1963).
- Supports brain development: Ethical care fosters safe, low-stress environments that are essential for healthy brain growth during rapid development (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2007).
- Protecting the vulnerable: Adults have an ethical duty to act in children's best interests and ensure their safety, as children cannot always advocate for themselves (UNICEF, 2014).
- Societal benefits arise from good ethical experiences in early life, which lead to better long-term outcomes in education, mental health, and social skills, ultimately benefiting society (Schweinhart et al., 2005).
- Teaches by example: Children learn ethics by observing adults, which makes ethical caregivers powerful role models (Bandura, 1977).
- Promotes fairness: Ethical practices in early education help ensure equitable opportunities for all children, fostering social justice (NAEYC, 2011).

Ignoring these ethical guidelines can lead to serious harm. For example, if children are subjected to upsetting research without adequate protection, they might suffer psychological harm, such as anxiety or trauma (Wailling et al., 2022).

Participant Withdrawal and Consent

According to BERA guidelines (2018), the practitioner in this research can withdraw from an interview or stop an observation without explanation. **Consent process**

Informed consent from parents or guardians:

The practitioners will obtain written informed consent from all parents or guardians before their children participate (Amayoa et al., 2022).

The consent form will be clear, easy to understand, free of jargon, and translated into multiple languages for our diverse participants.

It will clearly outline the study's purpose, procedures, duration, potential risks and benefits, and confirm that participation is voluntary (Spriggs, 2010).

Parents will be informed that they can withdraw consent without negative consequences for themselves or their child. This will provide parents ample time to ask questions and discuss concerns before signing the form (Amayoa et al., 2022).

Assent from children:

Although children under five cannot legally consent, practitioners will seek their age-appropriate assent by:

Using simple, pictorial explanations of what they will be doing.

Continuously observe the child to determine if they are willing to participate.

Respect all verbal and non-verbal cues, such as body language, that indicate discomfort or unwillingness (Alderson and Morrow, 2020).

Protection of confidentiality and anonymity

According to BERA's 2018 guidelines, this research will safeguard participant privacy through data de-identification. Each child and family will receive a unique identification code. All names and direct identifiers will be removed from the datasets, replaced with these codes, and stored separately in an encrypted file, accessible only to the principal investigator.

Ensuring privacy in data collection

Following BERA (2018) guidelines, ensuring privacy during data collection is a priority. All assessments and interviews will take place in private settings to prevent any conversations from being overheard. Language assessment sessions will be scheduled to minimize disruptions and avoid drawing unnecessary attention to the child's involvement. Additionally, video recordings of language samples will be made with minimal intrusion, ensuring only essential personnel are present.

To protect privacy, practitioners will only use aggregated data in publications. Any case studies or examples will be fully anonymized, with details altered to prevent identification. Photos or videos will only be used with explicit permission, and

identifiable features will be obscured if publicly shared. Participants will be informed about how their data might be used or shared before consent (Flewitt,2005).

Cultural and social sensitivity

Under the BERA (2018) guidelines, practitioners in this research will maintain cultural and social sensitivity. This means recognizing that language delay may be stigmatized in certain communities. They will pay careful attention to local cultural norms regarding privacy and disclosure and actively work to protect participating families from potential judgment or stigmatization by the community.

Recognising withdrawal of consent/assent

According to BERA (2018) guidelines, researchers will be trained to recognize signs that indicate a child no longer wishes to participate. These signs include:

- Verbal refusal or expressed discomfort.
- Reluctance to engage or withdrawing physically,
- Crying, increased anxiety, or distress.
- Consistently avoiding eye contact or engaging with researchers.

If any of these cues are observed, activities will be paused immediately, and the child's wishes will be respected without question. Parents will also receive regular reminders throughout the study that they can withdraw their child at any point without needing to provide a reason. We will conduct regular check-ins with both parents and children to ensure their ongoing willingness to participate (Hammarberg, 1990).

Risk reduction strategies

For participant safety

Practitioners will implement strong risk reduction strategies to ensure participant well-being and study integrity. They will receive training on working with young children, recognizing distress, and following clear protocols for managing difficult situations and determining when to end a session. Regular debriefing, supervision, and professional boundary guidelines will support researchers with established procedures for incident reporting and support (Wailling et al.,2022).

Actions of practitioners for parents/caregivers

Practitioners will ensure that parents and caregivers feel supported by framing questions neutrally and maintaining a supportive atmosphere that avoids placing blame for language delays. They will communicate time commitments, offer flexible scheduling, and provide practical support such as transportation or home visits. Finally, practitioners will clearly explain the mandatory reporting guidelines before obtaining consent (NAEXC,2011).

Researcher Guidelines

Researchers will receive specialized training on working with young children and recognizing signs of distress. They will adhere to clear protocols for managing challenging situations, including when to conclude a session. Regular debriefing and supervision sessions will offer support, along with strict guidelines for maintaining professional boundaries (Uwtsd.ac.uk, 2025).

University Responsibilities

The university will ensure an ethics review and approval before the study begins, with regular monitoring throughout. They will provide insurance, maintain clear communication with partners, and disclose funding sources transparently. Complaint protocols will also be established (Uwtsd.ac.uk, 2025).

For this research

It will collect data using qualified professionals for language assessments, validated environmental check tools, and standardized observation protocols. Interviews will be semi-structured and sensitive. All physical data is stored in locked university cabinets, while electronic data resides on encrypted, password-protected servers. Audio and video recordings are promptly transferred to secure storage and deleted from devices. It will ensure full compliance with GDPR, COPPA, university policies, and funding regulations. Data is retained for 5 to 7 years, with a clear timeline for shredding physical copies and permanently deleting digital files; audio and video may be destroyed sooner (Uwtsd.ac.uk, 2025).

Ethical Considerations in Research on Language Delay

This research on language delay includes particular ethical considerations to safeguard the well-being of participants and enhance the utility of findings.

Preventing stigmatization

The practitioners will carefully frame the research to prevent labelling or stigmatizing children with language delays. They will use strength-based approaches to discuss child development with families and consider how research findings might influence perceptions of these children (Uwtsd.ac.uk, 2025).

Offering benefits to participants

They aim to directly benefit participants by sharing overall results and recommendations with families. They will also provide information on language development and supportive strategies and establish referral pathways for children needing additional assistance. Ultimately, their findings will enhance services and support for children with language delays (Hammarberg, 1990).

Cultural and linguistic diversity

Practitioners will identify cultural variations in language development and parenting in this study. The assessment tools will be culturally sensitive, considering multilingualism and dialect differences. They will also offer interpretation services when necessary to ensure accurate communication with families.

This comprehensive ethical framework will ensure that the study on environmental and psychosocial factors in language delay meets the highest standards of respect, protection, and benefits for young participants and their families. By thoroughly addressing consent, confidentiality, risk reduction, and data management, the research team demonstrates a strong commitment to ethical practice while generating valuable knowledge to assist children with language delays (Hammarberg, 1990).

Reference

Almeida, F. (2018). Strategies to perform a mixed methods study. *European Journal of Education Studies*, [online] 5(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v0i0.1902>.

A., K. (n.d.). *Observation method: A review study. Library Philosophy and Practice*. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>. [Accessed 2023].

Annick De Houwer (2015). *Foreword. A personal account of foreign language learning and some additional thoughts*. [online] Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284550349_Foreword_A_personal_account_of_foreign_language_learning_and_some_additional_thoughts.

Bialystok, E. (2017). The bilingual adaptation: How minds accommodate experience. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(3), pp.233–262. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000099>.

Cho Blair, K., Park, E. and Kim, W. (2020). A meta-analysis of tier 2 interventions implemented within school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Psychology in the Schools*, 58(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22443>.

Creswell, J.W. and Clark, V.L.P. (2017). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Google Books. SAGE Publications. van IJzendoorn, M.H., Rutgers, A.H., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M.J., Swinkels, S.H.N., van Daalen, E., Dietz, C., Naber, F.B.A., Buitelaar, J.K. and van Engeland, H. (2007). Parental Sensitivity and Attachment in Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder: Comparison With Children With Mental Retardation, With Language Delays, and With Typical Development. *Child Development*, 78(2), pp.597–608. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01016.x>.

Curry, L.A., Nembhard, I.M. and Bradley, E.H. (2019). Qualitative and Mixed Methods Provide Unique Contributions to Outcomes Research. *Circulation*, 119(10), pp.1442–1452.

Cyck, L.M. and Durán, L. (2020). Supporting Young Children with Disabilities and Their Families from Undocumented Immigrant Backgrounds: Recommendations for Program Leaders and Practitioners. *Young Exceptional Children*, [online] 23(4), pp.212–224. Available at: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1280077> [Accessed 15 May 2025].

Evans, V. and Green, M. (2018). *Cognitive Linguistics an Introduction*. [online] Routledge. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315864327>.

Denny, E. and Weckesser, A. (2022). How to do qualitative research? *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*, 129(7), pp.1166–1167. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.17150>

Fernald, D.H., Simpson, M.J., Nease, D.E., Hahn, D.L., Hoffmann, A.E., Michaels, L.C., Fagnan, L.J., Daly, J.M. and Levy, B.T. (2018). Implementing Community-Created Self-Management Support Tools in Primary Care Practices: Multimethod Analysis From the INSTTEPP Study. *Journal of patient-centered research and reviews*, 5(4), pp.267–275. doi:<https://doi.org/10.17294/2330-0698.1634>.

Gabrieli, G., Lee, A., Setoh, P. and Esposito, G. (2021). An Analysis of the Generalizability and Stability of the Halo Effect During the COVID-19 Pandemic Outbreak. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.631871>.

Google Books. (2018). *Doing Your Early Years Research Project*. [online] Available at:https://books.google.co.uk/books/about/Doing_Your_Early_Years_Research_Project.html?id=JWBODwAAQBAJ&redir_esc=y [Accessed 24 May 2025].

Hoff, E., Core, C., Place, S., Rumiche, R., Senor, M. and Parra, M. (2012). Dual language exposure and early bilingual development. *Journal of Child Language*, 39(01), pp.1–27. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0305000910000759>.

Hutton, J.S., Dudley, J., Horowitz-Kraus, T., DeWitt, T. and Holland, S.K. (2020). Associations Between Screen-Based Media Use and Brain White Matter Integrity in

Preschool-Aged Children. *JAMA Pediatrics*, [online] 174(1), p.e193869.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2019.3869>.

Kallio, H., Pietilä, A.-M., Johnson, M. and Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic Methodological review: Developing a Framework for a Qualitative semi-structured Interview Guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 72(12), pp.2954–2965.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031>.

Kanhere, S. and Sunderajan, T. (2019). Speech and language delay in children: Prevalence and risk factors. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, [online] 8(5), p.1642. doi:https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmmpc.jfmmpc_162_19.

Weisleder, A. and Fernald, A. (2013). Talking to Children matters: Early Language Experience Strengthens Processing and Builds Vocabulary. *Psychological Science*, 24(11), pp.2143–2152.

Kostyrka-Allchorne, K., Cooper, N.R. and Simpson, A. (2017). The relationship between television exposure and children's cognition and behaviour: A systematic review. *Developmental Review*, 44, pp.19–58.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2016.12.002>.

Kuhl, P.K. (2010). Brain Mechanisms in Early Language Acquisition. *Neuron*, [online] 67(5), pp.713–727. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2010.08.038>.

Law, J., Charlton, J., Dockrell, J., Gascoigne, M., McKean, C. and Theakston, A. (2017). Early Language Development: Needs, provision, and intervention for preschool children from socio-economically disadvantage backgrounds: A Report for the Education Endowment Foundation: October 2017. *research.manchester.ac.uk*. [online] Available at: <https://research.manchester.ac.uk/en/publications/early-language-development-needs-provision-and-intervention-for-p>.

Linebarger, D.L. and Vaala, S.E. (2025). Screen Media and Language Development in Infants and Toddlers: An Ecological Perspective. *Developmental Review*, [online] 30(2), pp.176–202. Available at: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ885307> [Accessed 16 May 2025].

Madigan, S., McArthur, B.A., Anhorn, C., Eirich, R. and Christakis, D.A. (2020). Associations Between Screen Use and Child Language Skills. *JAMA Pediatrics*, [online] 174(7). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.0327>.

McLaughlin, M.R. (2011). Speech and language delay in children. *American Family Physician*, [online] 83(10), pp.1183–1188. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21568252/>.

Murray, A.D. and Yingling, J.L. (2000). Competence in Language at 24 Months: Relations with Attachment Security and Home Stimulation. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 161(2), pp.133–140. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221320009596700>.

Norbury, C.F., Gooch, D., Wray, C., Baird, G., Charman, T., Simonoff, E., Vamvakas, G. and Pickles, A. (2016). The impact of nonverbal ability on prevalence and clinical presentation of language disorder: evidence from a population study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, [online] 57(11), pp.1247–1257. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12573>.

Oswald, D., Sherratt, F. and Smith, S. (2014). Handling the Hawthorne effect: The challenges surrounding a participant observer. *Review of Social Studies*, [online] 1(1), pp.53–73. Available at: <https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/handling-the-hawthorne-effect-the-challenges-surrounding-a-partic>.

Oup.com. (2022). Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/edited-volume/34283>.

Pace, A., Luo, R., Hirsh-Pasek, K. and Golinkoff, R.M. (2017). Identifying Pathways Between Socioeconomic Status and Language Development. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, [online] 3(1), pp.285–308. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011516-034226>.

Romeo, R.R., Leonard, J.A., Robinson, S.T., West, M.R., Mackey, A.P., Rowe, M.L. and Gabrieli, J.D.E. (2018). Beyond the 30-Million-Word Gap: Children's Conversational Exposure Is Associated With Language-Related Brain Function.

Psychological Science, [online] 29(5), pp.700–710.

doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617742725>.

Paradis, E., Brien, B.O., Nimmon, L., Bandiera, G. and Martimianakis, M.A. (2016).

Design: Selection of Data Collection Methods. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, [online] 8(2), pp.263–264. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-16-00098.1>.

Perlman, D., Taylor, E., Moxham, L. and Patterson, C. (2019). Nursing students' self-determination: the influence on stigmatizing attitude within clinical placement settings. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 28(3), pp.706–711.

doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12572>.

psycnet.apa.org. (n.d.). *APA PsycNet*. [online] Available at:

<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-10968-006>.

Reilly, T., Morris, T. and Whyte, G. (2009). The specificity of training prescription and physiological assessment: A review. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 27(6), pp.575–589.

doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410902729741>.

Rowe, M.L. (2018). Understanding Socioeconomic Differences in Parents' Speech to Children. *Child Development Perspectives*, 12(2), pp.122–127.

doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12271>.

r2.vlereader.com. (n.d.). *ExpiredInvalid*. [online] Available at:

<https://r2.vlereader.com/EpubReader?ean=1781315456515>.

Saint-Georges, C., Chetouani, M., Cassel, R., Apicella, F., Mahdhaoui, A., Muratori, F., Laznik, M.-C. and Cohen, D. (2013). Motherese in Interaction: At the Cross-Road of Emotion and Cognition? (A Systematic Review). *PLoS ONE*, 8(10).

doi:<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0078103>.

Salo, S.J., Flykt, M., Mäkelä, J., Biringen, Z., Kalland, M., Pajulo, M. and Punamäki, R.L. (2019). The effectiveness of Nurture and Play: a mentalisation-based parenting

group intervention for prenatally depressed mothers. *Primary Health Care Research & Development*, 20. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/s1463423619000914>.

Saidmamatov, O., Raximov, Q., Rodrigues, P. and Vasconcelos, O. (2022).

Stein, A., Pearson, R.M., Goodman, S.H., Rapa, E., Rahman, A., McCallum, M., Howard, L.M. and Pariante, C.M. (2014). Effects of perinatal mental disorders on the fetus and child. *The Lancet*, 384(9956), pp.1800–1819.
doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(14\)61277-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(14)61277-0).

Sylvestre, A., Bussi eres,  . .L. and Bouchard, C. (2015). Language Problems Among Abused and Neglected Children. *Child Maltreatment*, [online] 21(1), pp.47–58.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559515616703>.

Tamis-LeMonda, C.S., Kuchirko, Y. and Song, L. (2014). Why Is Infant Language Learning Facilitated by Parental Responsiveness? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(2), pp.121–126.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414522813>.

Uwtsd.ac.uk. (2025). Available at: <https://research-ebSCO-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/c/onvpsy/search/details/elfibfmmf5?db=e001mww> [Accessed 24 May 2025].

Uwtsd.ac.uk. (2025). Available at: https://www-cambridge-org.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/C9527F1E4691021A1779A02BA53CEEBA/9781107449893c5_p46-57_CBO.pdf/designin [Accessed 24 May 2025]

Zhu, C., Li, X., Zhang, B. and Lin, Z. (2017). Quantitative analysis of multi-components by single marker—a rational method for the internal quality of Chinese herbal medicine. *Integrative Medicine Research*, 6(1), pp.1–11.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.imr.2017.01.008>.