BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

FAMILY AND EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS IN DEVELOPING VOCABULARY AND CONNECTED SPEECH IN CHILDREN WITH COCHLEAR IMPLANTS

Kamoldinova Muazzam
Lecturer, Andijan State Pedagogical Institute
Email: axmadjanovamuazzam820@gmail.com
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23911136

ABSTRACT. This article analyzes the family and educational conditions that support the acquisition of word meanings and the development of connected speech in children with cochlear implants. The research approaches of N.Z. Raxmonova and Z.N. Mamarajabova are compared with international studies of parental sensitivity, conversational support, vocabulary instruction, and narrative intervention. Vocabulary breadth and semantic depth are distinguished, as are narrative microstructure and macrostructure. The analysis proposes a partnership model that involves agreeing on a shared goal, enriching meaning in natural contexts, gradually reducing narrative scaffolding, and observing independent language use in new situations. It argues that family involvement should not become a basis for blaming families for their children's outcomes. The article presents a theoretical and methodological synthesis and reports no new empirical findings.
Keywords: cochlear implant, vocabulary, word meaning, connected speech, narrative, family partnership, parent coaching, communicative participation.

INTRODUCTION. Naming a familiar object, describing its characteristics, and explaining an event involving that object to a conversation partner are distinct language tasks for a child with a cochlear implant. Focusing solely on the number of memorized words in education does not fully reveal the child's ability to express meaning in a new context. A child may name an object in a picture but be unable to use that word to explain the reason for an action. Developing vocabulary and connected speech therefore requires more than increasing the number of words: it requires integrating them into purposeful communication.

In this article, vocabulary is understood in terms of word comprehension, expressive use, and the acquisition of relationships between meanings. Connected speech is not merely a sequence of several sentences; it is the meaningful organization of a story, description, or explanation that a conversation partner can understand. Relevant aspects include identifying the participants, explaining what happened, establishing causal relationships, and providing the information the listener needs. Speaking at length and producing a coherent account are not equivalent indicators.

The central issue in collaboration between the family and the educational institution extends beyond reproducing a teaching session exactly at home. Children encounter different meaningful situations at home, in their group, and in other everyday settings. Unless these experiences are connected by a shared language goal, an item learned during practice may remain tied to a limited context. Conversely, requiring the family to perform a specialist's role every day may create a mismatch between the continuity of support and the family's actual capacity.

The aim of this article is to compare Uzbek and international research to identify the conditions for collaboration that support semantic vocabulary development and coherent expression. The central question concerns how an educational goal can be carried into everyday family communication and how outcomes can be distinguished from memorized responses. The study focuses on lexical-semantic and narrative activity. Accordingly, sound discrimination and articulatory correction are not treated as separate objects of analysis in this article.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Higher Attestation Commission announcement concerning N.Z. Raxmonova's research on the communicative skills of preschool children with cochlear implants identifies individualized educational pathways, parents' pedagogical competence, and teacher–child–family collaboration as key elements [1]. This approach is significant because it envisages developmental support extending beyond individual teaching sessions. The official announcement does not provide the full protocol for family collaboration or quantify its independent effect. It therefore provides a basis for describing a local research direction rather than demonstrating the guaranteed effectiveness of a particular home activity.

The official information on Z.N. Mamarajabova's DSc research into language development among hard-of-hearing pupils through literary education connects comprehension of a literary work, oral expression of ideas, reading engagement, and literary-creative activity [2]. Its progression from meaningful activity to independent expression of ideas is methodologically relevant to this article. However, findings concerning hard-of-hearing schoolchildren do not constitute direct empirical evidence for all preschool children with cochlear implants; adaptation must take account of age and language experience. A.L. Quittner and colleagues' four-year, multisite observational study included 188 children who received cochlear implants and 97 children with typical hearing. Even after early hearing experience and demographic factors were accounted for, maternal sensitivity and cognitive stimulation were associated with language development; linguistic stimulation was significant in the context of high sensitivity [3]. These findings highlight the importance of adapting conversational content to the child's initiatives. Because the observational design did not randomly assign these characteristics, it cannot be taken as causal evidence for a single recommendation given to parents.

M. Lavelli and colleagues studied 20 preschool children with cochlear implants and 40 children with typical hearing, matched by chronological age or hearing experience, during book reading and play with their mothers. In the cochlear implant group, maternal utterances that clarified information were associated with contextually appropriate responses when accompanied by gestures [4]. This finding elucidates the role of visual support in sustaining conversation. It does not provide a universal recommendation for selecting the same communication approach for all children or withdrawing visual support. J. Messier and C. Wood investigated word learning in 18 children with cochlear implants using definitions and videos embedded in electronic storybooks. Expressive labeling and word-definition performance for taught items were better than in the comparison condition; retention of expressive vocabulary was also observed at delayed testing [5]. Participants had functional speech perception. The finding therefore demonstrates the potential of an intervention with specific instructional content rather than the benefits of any electronic book for every child with a cochlear implant.

P. Zamani and colleagues randomly assigned 36 Persian-speaking children with cochlear implants, aged 5.5–7 years, to three groups. Group and individual narrative intervention were compared with conventional speech therapy. The narrative approaches produced superior microstructure outcomes, whereas macrostructure improved in all three conditions; no statistically significant difference was found between group and individual narrative approaches [6]. This distinction prevents the generalized conclusion that narrative instruction is superior on every outcome. The study did not test the independent effect of family collaboration. I. Giallini and colleagues' systematic review included five studies of parent training and coaching. Findings were promising for parental responsiveness and children's language, but variation in designs and

outcomes prevented a meta-analysis. The authors noted limitations in the strength of the evidence [7]. This does not mean that supporting parents is unnecessary; rather, it indicates the need to specify program components, implementation conditions, and expected outcomes. The review was not limited to cochlear implant users.

J. Jung and colleagues' 2026 study compared three groups, each comprising 12 child–caregiver dyads, during free play. During the first year after implant activation, the diversity of content-word forms in speech directed to children with cochlear implants was lower than in the comparison groups [8]. This observation highlights the need to investigate the quality of language input. The difference between groups cannot be interpreted as evidence of insufficient parental effort or parental fault: conversation is reciprocal, and children's responses may also influence it. T. Boons and colleagues examined expressive language after implantation across vocabulary, morphology, syntax, and narrative domains, drawing attention to difficulties in morphosyntactic and narrative skills [9]. This line of research shows that vocabulary assessment alone cannot represent connected speech. In the overall analysis, local ideas concerning meaningful activity and collaboration are complemented by the specific lexical, conversational, and narrative measures used in international research. Their findings are not combined into a single overall estimate of effectiveness.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study employed a focused narrative review and conceptual synthesis. Nine sources with verifiable bibliographic details were selected as of October 30, 2026. Local research directions were examined through official dissertation announcements, while international evidence was reviewed through original research articles and their publicly available scholarly descriptions. Selection criteria included relevance to the topic, a clear description of language outcomes, and the possibility of identifying sample or design limitations.

Four units of comparison were distinguished: the content learned by the child, the adult's communicative behavior, the context in which support was provided, and the outcome measured. Receptive vocabulary was distinguished from expressive use, narrative microstructure from the organization of meaning, and associations involving family responsiveness from the causal effects of a coaching program. Findings for young children or a particular language in one study were not automatically transferred to another group.

No new experiment, parent survey, or statistical measurement of children's speech was conducted. The review does not constitute a systematic search covering all publications. Its scholarly contribution consists of a theoretical synthesis that distinguishes the functions of the sources. The proposed partnership model and everyday situations were developed for subsequent empirical investigation; they are not presented as a direct translation of an international research protocol or as a newly validated program.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The synthesis proposes placing a shared, observable language goal at the center of the partnership. "Improving speech" does not adequately explain to either the family or the teacher what change to expect. For example, the goal of "recounting an event by indicating who was involved, what they did, and why it happened" enables more specific observation. The goal should reflect the child's current language abilities and everyday needs. It should help the child express the intended meaning without turning family communication into a continuous examination.

Vocabulary work should explicitly address depth of word meaning. Pointing to an object, describing its function, comparing its characteristics, and using its name in a new sentence provide different evidence of knowledge. Naming a "dish" differs from explaining the general function of

dishes. When this distinction is reflected in the educational plan, a list of taught words becomes a semantic system. The selection of numerals, verbs, and words expressing attributes and relationships should be tied to the message the child wishes to convey, avoiding a focus exclusively on object names.

Receptive and expressive outcomes should not be assessed as equivalent. A child may select a situation matching a word they hear but be unable to retrieve the word independently. Concluding that knowledge is entirely absent would be premature. Conversely, producing a label repeatedly practiced with a picture does not guarantee a deep understanding of its meaning. Assessment should include varied materials and simple explanation tasks. If the meaning is understood but expression is difficult, the teacher should adapt the type of support accordingly.

Planning conversation that responds to the child's interests involves more than instructing parents to ask more questions. An adult may comment on what the child is looking at or doing, expand the meaning of the child's brief contribution, and provide an opportunity to continue. For example, if the child says, "The car is stuck," a response such as "The car is stuck in the mud; how can we get it out?" creates a conversation about cause and solution. This example is not a fixed script; its suitability is assessed through the child's understanding and continuation of the conversation.

Narrative macrostructure concerns the relationships among the participants, setting, problem, action, and outcome. Microstructure concerns sentence construction, word choice, cohesive devices, and the use of grammatical forms. A child may tell a coherent story using simple sentences or produce complex sentences while leaving the connections between events unclear. A longer narrative therefore does not automatically indicate improved overall coherence. The component-specific differences in Zamani and colleagues' findings support this distinction [6].

Selecting everyday content for storytelling preserves the child's ownership of the event. The family may choose a familiar situation, such as a trip, preparing food together, or finding a lost object. The teacher identifies the meanings and cohesive devices the child needs in relation to that event. Rather than having the child memorize a prepared text, the parent allows the child to recount the event in their own sequence. A point the listener has not understood can then be clarified through a single follow-up question. The goal is to make the message understandable, not to repeat the same perfect text on every occasion.

Shared book reading should address meaning as well as text length. An unfamiliar word can be explained, attention drawn to the cause of an event, and the child invited to make a prediction. Pointing to a picture, using a brief written cue, or providing a familiar symbol may help convey meaning. These forms of support should be selected according to the child's needs, and supported performance should be distinguished from independent narration. When adults answer all the questions themselves, the conversation does not become the child's account; children must also have opportunities to answer and ask questions.

The value of a digital storytelling resource lies in how it explains word meanings, not in the presence of a screen. The intervention using definitions and videos investigated by Messier and Wood cannot be equated with all electronic books [5]. When selecting local materials, consideration should be given to the meaning of the illustrations, the comprehensibility of the speech, the potential for excessive animation to distract from conversation, and the child's ability to respond actively. If the child does not use a word in a new situation after watching a video, viewing time alone should not be treated as an instructional outcome.

Parent coaching is proposed as a process linking instruction, demonstration, parent practice, and joint reflection. The teacher demonstrates a brief conversation, after which the parent applies

the same principle in a convenient everyday situation. Reflection focuses on which child initiatives emerged and which support was useful rather than simply asking, “Did you do it correctly?” This approach recognizes family knowledge as a resource. Given the limitations identified in Giallini and colleagues’ review, the independent effectiveness of this model cannot be considered established in advance [7].

Partnership records should not impose an excessive reporting burden on families. A brief note describing the situation, the new word or sentence used by the child, and the support provided may be sufficient. For example, “used ‘because’ independently during play” and “explained the reason after a question” indicate different levels of independence. These records serve to adapt education rather than monitor the amount of practice completed at home. Fewer records from a family cannot be used as grounds for concluding that communication with the child is absent.

Responsibilities within the partnership should be specified. The specialist examines the initial language profile and establishes goals and assessment procedures; the teacher creates opportunities for meaningful use during group activities; and the family provides information about the child’s everyday experiences and interests. The child is an active participant with opportunities for choice and initiative. This division of responsibilities does not require parents to perform diagnostic or clinical tasks. The family and specialist should agree on the content of support in understandable terms.

Adapting materials into Uzbek requires more than direct translation. It involves examining the use of words in the child’s environment, kinship terms, the familiarity of events, and the devices connecting sentences. For example, a causal sentence cannot be adequately assessed solely on whether the child produces a particular conjunction; the important question is whether the child conveys an actual causal relationship. Cultural familiarity may help the child understand the task, but a memorized event should not be reported as evidence of independent narration. In a multilingual family, goal setting begins with understanding the language resources available to the child. Differences between words used at home and items in the language of instruction should be recorded. A lack of response in one language cannot be equated with an absence of meaning across all languages. This article draws no empirical conclusion about whether monolingual or multilingual support is superior. The methodological requirement is to state clearly the language of assessment, the use of translation assistance, and the child’s usual means of expression.

Outcome assessment should ideally include a language sample extending beyond the selected target items. For vocabulary, assessment examines understanding of a new example, explanation of meaning, and use of the word in a different situation. For narratives, it records completeness of content, connections between events, clarity for the listener, and level of support. Directly comparing vocabulary diversity across very short samples or samples of different lengths may lead to erroneous conclusions. Tasks and sampling procedures should therefore be aligned as closely as possible.

Retelling a taught story indicates initial learning, whereas recounting a new event assesses transfer. Recording these outcomes separately reveals the distinction between memorization and independent construction of meaning. Delayed observation helps establish skill retention. If the teacher or parent asks more questions, a longer account cannot be interpreted solely as growth in the child’s independence. The type of support should be documented alongside the outcome itself.

Changes in the child should not be equated with family success or failure. Access to education, specialist support, language experience, and individual development may all contribute. The differences in language input identified by Jung and colleagues raise questions about strengthening support, not grounds for blaming parents [8]. The partnership should regularly address the family’s

and child's comfort, voluntary participation in communication, and the fit between support and everyday life.

Future research should describe family–educational institution collaboration itself precisely. The statement "parents participated" alone does not explain the content of coaching. Distinguishing demonstration, feedback, agreed goals, and records of implementation makes it possible to investigate which component is associated with which change. Where a comparison is included, usual support, baseline language proficiency, and the observation period should be specified. Outcomes should encompass independent narration and participation in real-life activities as well as vocabulary.

CONCLUSION. Vocabulary and connected speech development in children with cochlear implants should be viewed as a transition from memorizing words to independently organizing meaning. Uzbek scholars' approaches to collaboration and literary-creative activity intersect, to varying degrees, with international research on conversation, vocabulary instruction, and narrative intervention. However, an association involving parental responsiveness, the effects of targeted word instruction, and the outcomes of narrative intervention are not the same type of evidence. Respecting these boundaries strengthens the scientific basis of methodological recommendations.

The analysis proposes integrating shared goal setting, meaningful everyday activity, supportive parent coaching, and monitoring of independent use. Receptive and expressive vocabulary, narrative microstructure and macrostructure, and the level of support should be observed separately. The proposed model requires investigation in local settings; its value lies in clearly specifying the content of collaboration and the assessment procedures rather than guaranteeing an outcome.

REFERENCES

1. Higher Attestation Commission. Announcement of the defense of the PhD dissertation by Raxmonova Nilufar Zakirjonovna entitled "Technology for Developing Communicative Skills in Preschool Children with Cochlear Implants."
2. Higher Attestation Commission. Announcement of the defense of the DSc dissertation by Mamarajabova Zulfiya Narboyevna entitled "Developing the Speech of Hard-of-Hearing Pupils through Literary Education." URL: https://oak.uz/index.php/pages/5008.
3. Quittner A.L., Cruz I., Barker D.H., Tobey E., Eisenberg L.S., Niparko J.K. Effects of Maternal Sensitivity and Cognitive and Linguistic Stimulation on Cochlear Implant Users' Language Development over Four Years. The Journal of Pediatrics. 2013;162(2):343–348.e3.
4. Lavelli M., Majorano M., Guerzoni L., Murri A., Barachetti C., Cuda D. Communication dynamics between mothers and their children with cochlear implants: Effects of maternal support for language production. Journal of Communication Disorders. 2018;73:1–14.
5. Messier J., Wood C. Facilitating Vocabulary Acquisition of Children With Cochlear Implants Using Electronic Storybooks. Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education. 2015;20(4):356–373.
6. Zamani P., Soleymani Z., Jalaie S., Motasaddi Zarandy M. The effects of narrative-based language intervention (NBLI) on spoken narrative structures in Persian-speaking cochlear implanted children: A prospective randomized control trial. International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology. 2018;112:141–150.
7. Giallini I., Nicastri M., Mariani L., Turchetta R., Ruoppolo G., de Vincentiis M., De Vito C., Sciurti A., Baccolini V., Mancini P. Benefits of Parent Training in the Rehabilitation of Deaf

or Hard of Hearing Children of Hearing Parents: A Systematic Review. Audiology Research. 2021;11(4):653–672.
8. Jung J., Wang Y., Bergeson T., Houston D. Caregivers' vocabulary use for children with cochlear implants and children with normal hearing during the first year of post-activation. Infant Behavior and Development. 2026;82:102176.
9. Boons T., De Raeve L., Langereis M., Peeraer L., Wouters J., van Wieringen A. Expressive vocabulary, morphology, syntax and narrative skills in profoundly deaf children after early cochlear implantation. Research in Developmental Disabilities. 2013;34(6):2008–2022.