

DIALOGUE BETWEEN PARENTS AND DEVELOPMENT RISK BABIES

Diálogo de pais e bebês em situação de risco ao desenvolvimento

Mariana Rodrigues Flores ⁽¹⁾, Ana Paula Ramos de Souza ⁽²⁾

ABSTRACT

Purpose: to investigate the enunciative relationships which are established between parents and children who have risk factors for infant developmental problems, especially the effects of the risks during the language acquisition process. **Methods:** the sample consisted of study of three children who present risks for development, who were observed from 0 to 18 months through the Clinical Risk Indicators in Child Development, and through filmed samples with parents and children interaction. The data analysis considered the enunciative approach by Carmen Silva (2007, 2009) and the psychoanalytic approach. **Results:** by analyzing the three cases, it was possible to evidence that all of them presented difficulties of mother-baby separation, what reflected in the language semantization process, when the number of interlocutors became higher. However, the subjects evidenced the possibility of language semiotic domain, observing the three enunciative mechanisms proposed by Silva (2007). **Conclusions:** the study evidenced that the difficulties of mother-baby separation and the weak entrance of the paternal function have made the position of the children in the language more difficult, because the children are dependant of parents' speech for their own productions.

KEYWORDS: Child Development; Language; Father-Child Relations; Mother-Child Relations

■ INTRODUCTION

Human nature is not established in the body, but rather in the field of language (of the Other, transmitter of signifiers) woven by the symbolic. Therefore, the subject does not stand alone, but by means of other psychic apparatuses, i.e., other "linguistic devices." Thus, the psychic constitution of the child is dependent on initial interactive processes¹. Infants are born helpless and unable to signify their endogenous tension and, as a result, they utter a cry, which is not appeal at first because it is only the utterance of pain. It is the response from the Other that turns the cry into an appeal, and the subject is considered a being².

There is, accordingly, an "other" - usually the agent of the maternal function - that plays the role of mediator between the child and the language, because from birth, the child is introduced into a world whose main adult interlocutors attribute meanings and intentions to their gestures, their gazes and their vocal emissions as if it were a conversational partner³. Thus, the baby is engaged by maternal speech, and even if no word is uttered, there is a dyad that is in line, which makes it seem like they are conversing. This way, they are both embedded in language, in cultural laws, precisely what tells human babies apart from animal offspring⁴.

The development of children's language is evidenced by three enunciative operations: filling in the place of enunciation, where occurs the passage filling in place of enunciation from the "other" to the recognition that this place brings in "other"; the reference is the transition of updating a reference to a reference shown constituted in language-speech; and expository description of the child in speech-language having to pass a discursive act of subjective instantiation through the forms and

⁽¹⁾ Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM), Santa Maria, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.

⁽²⁾ Speech Therapy Department, Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM), Santa Maria, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.

Research funding: Scholarship from Capes (Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel)

Conflict of interest: non existent

functions for use in the speech utterance forms another enunciation³.

Typically, the difficulties in the field of psychic constitution do not receive due attention from the early well-child care, which may hinder child development. In order to warn health professionals about that, a group of psychoanalysts has created the Risk Indicators for Child Development (IRDIs), an instrument capable of detecting risks to child development through observation of the baby and its primary caregiver. It is hoped that this tool will serve as a warning so that early intervention is performed while there is a significant higher permeability and greater neuronal plasticity⁵.

Considering these aspects, the aim of this paper is to investigate the effects of the presence of risk to the development process of language acquisition of children based on the enunciative relationships between parents and children.

■ METHODS

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee under number CAAE 0284.0.243.000-09. Parents signed a consent form allowing the research to be conducted.

The sample was selected from three cases, for the sake of convenience, from the project "Parental Roles and risk factors to acquisition of language: speech therapy interventions", whereby children were monitored from 0 to 18 months. The children selected were those with the higher number of IRDIs absent in phase IV, from 12 to 18 months, when the paternal function is crucial. The paternal function axis was prioritized, because the final results of the research on IRDI showed that this axis had the highest predictive power⁵. Moreover, studies of the research group, which incorporates this study, indicate a relationship between the difficulty in establishing this function and language disorders in children⁶⁻⁸. Whereas those studies investigated children with biological limits (verbal dyspraxia and autism), this study includes children who do not exhibit biological limits of oral language.

The evaluations were made in a university hospital in the central region of the state of Rio Grande do Sul, southern Brazil, and at the Speech and Hearing Pathology Service, both at the university where the survey was conducted. The children were analyzed, along with their primary caregivers, based on their IRDIs⁹. During the assessment period, the children

and their mothers were evaluated as for the exercise of the maternal function through an interview about the experience of motherhood, validation of maternal mood states by Beck Depression Inventory (depression and anxiety), IRDIs, videotaping of interactions with parents, feeding transition protocol and observation of early speech production. However, this study focuses on evaluations made in phase IV of IRDIs and footage of parent-child interactions. Videotaping lasted 20 min, and the footage was transcribed for later analysis. Father and mother were asked to videotape the interactions with their children separately; however, the children could not be videotaped without the presence of their mothers because they would not do it without them. Parents could use a variety of toys available, appropriate for children's age range. The only requirement was that they should interact with their child as usual. Mothers and babies with the presence of risks were referred for psychotherapy.

To build the presentation of cases, enunciative scenes that illustrate the linguistic-enunciative operation between parents and baby have been selected. The scenes were first analyzed by a speech therapist who did not know the history of each case and, subsequently, by the psychologist who conducted the study.

The research was qualitative and data analysis was based on enunciative assumptions proposed by Carmen Silva³.

■ RESULTS

Case 1 - S1, M1 and P1

S1 is a 19-month-old girl whose conception was highly desired by parents. The mother (M1) is a 30-year-old housewife and the 35-year-old father (F1) works in sales and travels on business. The mother reports that she and her daughter "are very close together", which is evident from the fact that child sleeps with her parents and requests breastfeeding, which is indicative of difficulty transitioning to solid and semi-solid food (IRDI 14). This also happens in the absence of IRDI 15 (the mother alternates moments of attention to her child with other interests), IRDI 16 (child tolerates brief absences of her mother) and IRDI 17, because M1 feels obliged to meet all of S1's desires. The parents reported that S1 has "fits of anger".

Figure 1 reports scenes between M1 and S1.

Line	Interlocutor	Verbal manifestations	Comments on context or intonation
SCENE 1			
1	M1	-Sit down, sit down with mommie. Tchimbuuuum.	Mother is sitting on a mat and picks up some toys.
2	S1		She sits next to her mother and picks up a doll.
3	M1	- Baby is gonna sleep? Sleep, eep, eep, eep,...	She speaks softly.
4	S1	Hmmm	She points to the basket full of toys.
5	M1	-What's inside the basket? Is there a doggie? Where is the doggie?	She brings the basket close to S1.
6	S1	-Doggie.	She looks at M1.
7	M1	-The doggie, darling.	She smiles as she talks to S1.
8	S1	Uh, uh, uh....	She fetches the toy dog and pretends to tuck him in.
9	M1	-Are you tucking the doggie in, sweetie?	She shows interest in S1's action.
SCENE 2			
10	S1		She shows interest in the mirror.
11	M1	-What's it over there?	She helps S1 to stand up.
12	S1	-Hum hum...	She stands up in front of the mirror.
13	M1	-S1 in dress? In little dress?	
14	S1		She turns around and keeps looking at the camcorder.
15	M1	-Is S1 being naughty?	She speaks in a relaxed tone and smiles.
16	S1		She keeps looking at the camcorder and looks suspicious.
17	M1	-What is that look on you face, my baby, what pose is that, huh?	She speaks in a relaxed tone and smiles.
18	S1	-The baby, baby.	She points to the sticker on the mirror.
19	M1	-Leave the little baby on, it doesn't come off. Doesn't want to play with mommie.	Shows another toy to S1.
SCENE 3			
20	M1	-Where's mommie's baby?	She smiles as she talks to S1.
21	S1	-The baby.	Points at herself.
SCENE 4			
22	S1	-Breast	Comes to M1's lap.
23	M1	-Let's play, breastfeed later.	Has S1 and a doll on her lap.
24	S1		Sits on M1's lap so the doll is no longer part of the play.
25	M1	Let's play.	Offers another toy.
26	S1	-Huum...	Takes and smiles at M1.
27	M1	- Here's little frog! Horse, doggie.	Gets the toys in the basket and shows them to S1.
28	S1	-Ox?	Asks about the toy that had not been offered.
SCENE 5			
30	S1	-Armadillo	Talks as she looks at her feet.
31	M1		S1's shoe fell off. Mother lifts up S1, places her on her lap and puts her shoe back on.
SCENE 6			
32	M1	-What is it?	
33	S1	-The ball.	Tries to put it away in the basket, but the ball falls on the floor and S1 finds it funny.
34	M1	-The ball.	Throws the ball at S1 for her to catch it.
35	S1	-Ahh.	Finds it funny.

Figure 1 – Scenes for Interaction and Dialog between M1 and S1

Taking the enunciative mechanisms described by Silva (2007) into consideration, scene 1 that M1 prompts S1 to fill with gestures and vocalizations the “tuck in the baby” (line 3), which the girl reproduces (line 8). It is a connective mechanism in which S1 recognizes that her action has an effect upon the other. For example, when she picks up the “doggie”, she reproduces the action of tucking without her mother’s request (line 8). At the same scene, when the mother asks after the “doggie”, the child repeats after her mother’s speech, deploying the strategy of repeating the word “you” in lieu of “I” (line 6), as a part of the second enunciative mechanism for establishing co-reference.

At scene 2, the child performing a deictic nomination before the baby sticker pasted on the mirror (line 18), which is also a strategy expected in the mechanism that involves the establishment of co-reference. Also at scenes 4, 5 and 6, strategies of the second mechanism for establishing co-reference are used, e.g. the request from I to you by verbal reference when requesting “mama” (line 22) and by stating “ox” (line 28) and also the comment about the shoe that needs to be tidied up (line 30). They both belong to the second strategy outlined by Silva (op.cit) in establishing co-reference.

At scene 3, element of the third mechanism was observed by the use of the third person through a common noun in reference to herself, when she utters “the baby” as she looks at herself in the mirror, and points to herself (line 21). This child has a variety of enunciative mechanisms and strategies. Their dialog flows and the mother has good interaction with her. The mother is attentive and she knows what the child wants, linguistically interpreting her daughter’s manifestations (verbal or auditory) in a way that is appropriate for the enunciative scene.

Figure 2 reports scenes between P1 and S1.

At scene 1, in addition to routine reproduction, aforementioned after Figure 2, the girl begins to show her mother some objects. The child shows that she cannot be alone with her father, which seems to prevent play from taking place between them. S1

answers her father’s question (line 7) at the same scene by uttering “auauau” (line 8). Once again, the ability to co-relate of the second mechanism is expressed. Play happens more often at scene 2 because the desire to play with the ball causes S1 to engage in her father’s invitation.

It was observed that, despite the risks to development, there is no direct relation between development and the risk to language acquisition, if the semiotic field of language is considered, as S1 moves along three enunciative mechanisms and begins to establish the ability to co-refer, switching from shown reference to spoken reference. However, most of the time, she talks with her mother, which shows that wider ownership of language is difficult when interacting with different interlocutors (semantization of language). Therefore, although S1 masters the form-meaning relationship, her speech is limited because the inter-subjective relationship with her mother has established that the latter is her only interlocutor, and that her speech production should follow rituals and demands established by her mother.

Case 2: S2, M2 and P2

S2 is an 18-month-old girl whose conception was highly desired by her parents, especially her mother (M2), a 25-year-old housewife, who had always wanted a daughter, because her first child is a 6-year-old boy. After his birth, she had a miscarriage and it took her a long time to get pregnant again. The mother reported that the girl is “too sticky” and does not stay with anyone else, which made the mother request for assistance because she feels exhausted. Her 33-year-old father (F2) recognizes his daughter’s difficulties but he is often away on business trips. Because of this family dynamics, M2 cannot share her attention between looking after S2 and doing other chores (IRDI 15), as S2 does not tolerate short periods of absence of her mother (IRDI 16). In addition, the mother feels obliged to fulfill all of S2’s desires (IRDI 17).

Figure 3 reports the scenes between M2 and S2.

Line	Interlocutor	Verbal manifestations	Comments on context or intonation
SCENE 1			
1	P1	-Come on, take it. How do you do "pocotó"? Pototó-potocó-potocó.	Talks to the child.
2	S1		Takes the doll to her father.
3	P1	-Give the doll a little kiss. Give her a little kiss. Tuck her in. Ah ah, ahh...	Places the doll in the child's arms.
4	S1	-Ah. Ah, ah.	Takes another toy to her dad.
5	P1	-And this one?	
6	S1	-Ah ah, ah, ah...	Tucks in the doll while looks at the camcorder. Take the doll to mommie.
7	P1	-And what's this?	
8	S1	-Doggie.	Takes the toy dog from the toy basket,
9	P1	-Doggie, take it. Takes it.	Squeezes the toy to make a sound.
SCENE 2			
10	P1	-And this one? It's the soccer player. Here's the ball, look.	She shows interest in the mirror.
11	S1	-Ahh...The ball.	Walks up to her mother and shows the ball.
12	P1	-You haven't seen one thing there. Look at the ground, baby, the ball.	Points to the ball.
13	S1	-The ball. Ball	Points to the ball.
14	P1	-Come here, daddy will show you where the ball is.	Waves at S1.
15	S1	-Hum?	Come to daddy.
16	P1	-Under the sofa, pull the sofa hard.	Points to the ball.
17	S1	-Hum, hum...	Tries hard but can't get the ball. Looks at her dad.
18	P1	-Over there. OK, daddy will help.	Stands up and fetches the ball.
19	S1	-Eee...	Smiles at her dad.
20	P1	-OK, now kick the ball, kick it.	Smiles at child while talking.
21	S1	-Huum...	Shows enthusiasm.
22	P1	-Kick it, kick it to daddy...	Stands up in front of the child.
23	S1		Smiles/ Picks up the ball and takes it to the sofa where he dad is sitting.
24	P1		Sits down with the child.
25	S1	-Bó, bó...	Takes the ball to her mother, walks to her while smiling.

Figure 2 - Interaction scenes and Dialog between P1 and S1

Line	Interlocutor	Verbal manifestations	Comments on context or intonation
SCENE 1			
1	M2	-What do you want? Tell mommie, mommie can't understand.	Talks to S2 softly.
2	S2	-Hum, hum...ó.	Pulls M2 by the hand and arranges the chair.
3	M2	-Want me to sit here? Do you?	Looks at the chair.
4	S2	-yes.	Keeps arranging the position of the chair.
5	M2	-Why do you want mommie to sit down? Let's play! Look at the ball, it's beautiful!	Lifts up S2 and takes her towards the toys.
6	S2	Mmmm.	Sobs when M2 leaves her on the mat.
SCENE 2			
7	M2	-How beautiful! Let's pick it up, the baby is sleeping.	Picks up the doll from the floor.
8	S2	-Mimiu?	Stops playing with the toy car and goes towards the doll on the mat.
9	M2	-Yeah, sleep.	
SCENE 3			
10	S2	-Ma, Ma, Ma..	Holds M2's legs.
11	M2	-Wanna Milkie? Milkie?	Talks to S2 softly.
12	S2	-Milkie.	Arranges the chair in the direction of M2.
13	M2	-Is it good here? Is milkie good?	Places S2 on her lap and makes her comfortable for breastfeeding. M2 and S2 caress each other. M2 strokes S2's head and kisses it.
14	S2		Caresses S2's face.
15	M2	-Like your milkie? Love your milkie?	Speaks softly.
SCENE 4			
16	M2	-Who's that one over there?	Speaks to S2 by the mirror.
17	S2	-Baby.	Keeps looking at the mirror.
18	M2	-Say, it's mommie's Bibi.	Looks at S2 at the mirror.
19	S2	-Mommie Bibi.	
20	M2	-Show her mother mommie's Gabi.	Takes S2 off her lap.
21	S2	(unintelligible speech)	Walks to the mirror and looks at herself.
22	M2	-Don't hit the mirror, baby.	Sits on the chair and observes S2.

Figure 3 - Interaction Scenes and Dialog between M2 and S2

At scene 1, S2 plays, but she controls her mother's actions. At scene 2, in enunciative terms, she says, in line 8, the doll fell asleep ("mimiu"), which exemplifies a deictic comment about the situation, as evidence of the second enunciative mechanism. The mother responds by repeating her daughter's utterance (line 9). There is harmony between M2 and S2, but the girl feels extremely anxious about separating from her mother, which is not remarkably signaled in language. However, at scene 3, the mother interprets S2's request as "breast" when it could be simply "mom" (because the words sound very similar in Portuguese), and she grants her daughter's request. Then a speech begins, where the separation of both their bodies is confusing (lines 10-15).

Other enunciative mechanisms emerge in the exemplified scenes, e.g. repeating S2's routines at the request of her mother (first mechanism, strategy II), self-reference as "baby" or "mommie Bibi" (line 17), where she matches words (second mechanism). However, when referring to "mommie Bibi" (line 19) at scene 4, one can see a discursive marker whereby S2 is seen as if "glued" to the mother, resisting the separation process, although it is also evidence of the mastery of the third enunciative mechanism for establishing the subject in the speech by using her own name. In Figure 4, it is evident that such bonding with her mother's body hinders the interactions between S2 and F2, because the girl constantly seeks interaction with her mother while her father tries to play with her.

Line	Interlocutor	Verbal manifestations	Comments on context or intonation
SCENE 1			
1	P2	-Is it the alligator? Look at the alligator!	Looks at S2 while talking to her but doesn't let her speak.
2	P2	-What's this? Hum?	
3	S2	-Gator.	Sitting on the mat with F2.
4	P2	-Let's assemble here, huh? Put it on the mat, let's see.	Shows how to connect the parts and gives the toy to S2.
5	S2		Responds to F2's play.
6	P2	-See the little bee? Shake it like this.	Shows another toy to S2.
7	S2	-Lil' bee.	Explores the toy and looks at F2.
8	P2	-Lil' bee, sweetie? Shake the lil' bee.	Strokes the toy bee.
9	S2	-Lil' Bee.	Smiles at F2.
10	P2	-It's the bee.	
SCENE 2			
11	S2	-Foot.	Shows her foot to daddy.
12	P2	-S2's little foot, how cute! And the knee.	Strokes S2's foot and speaks softly.
13	S2	-Hum.	Points to her eye.
14	P2	-The eye?! Eye, foot and knee.	Plays with S2's knee.
15	S2	-Ouch.	Draws leg away.
SCENE 3			
16	P2	-And the baby? See the baby sleeping? See how beautiful it is?	Fetches a doll and shows it to S2.
17	S2	-See.	Seems to agree with P2.

Figure 4 - Interaction scenes and Dialog between P2 and S2

At scene 1, "you" is repeatedly used in the "I" speech when the child states "ae" (alligator) in line 3, "beinha" (little bee) in line 7, as examples of the verbal co-reference mechanism.

At scene 2, the child shows her foot (line 11) and points her knee towards her father (line 13); thus, she responds with a gesture to what is requested as a routine. This is a vocal or gestural response to requests to perform family routines, a strategy belonging to the mechanism of turn-filling from the perspective of the other.

Scene 3 shows that her father asks S2 a question (line 16) and she answers: "See" (line 17) speaking for herself using the first person, which is a form of instantiation of self (third enunciative mechanism for establishment of the subject in language), because there is the personal mark of self in the verb,

important input data of S2 in the speech. There are other scenes where she refuses to do the things suggested by her father, which he takes well.

Case 3: S3, M3, P3

S3 is a 17-month-old girl, the couple's first daughter, whose conception was highly desired. She is the daughter of M3 (29 years old), a housewife, and P3 (33 years old) an IT professional. S3's father's job allows him to work from home. S3 was born with two congenital health problems, but recovered well with the aid of treatment and has not had to undergo any surgery. However, her parents still feel very worried to date. The assessment of IRDs showed the absence of indicators 14, 15, 16, and 17, as was the case for S1.

Figure 5 reports scenes between M3 and S3.

Line	Interlocutor	Verbal manifestations	Comments on context or intonation
SCENE 1			
1	M3	-Are you lazy, my baby? Will kiss you and bite your little belly.	Plays with S3 on the mat.
2	S3	-Hum.	Likes playing with M3 and tries to avoid the tickles.
3	M3	-What is this? A plane!	Shows the toy to S3.
4	S3	-Ane	Plays with the plane while lying down. Looks sleepy.
SCENE 2			
5	M3	-Oh, my baby is lazy!	Caresses S3.
6	S3	-Huum.	Puts the toys away from her.
7	M3	-Oh, are you stressed? Stresses about the toys.	Emphasizes interrogative tone.
8	S3	-Ma!	Sits down and asks M3 for a toy.
9	M3	-Mommie winds the toy.	Understands S3's request and winds the toy.
SCENE 2			
10	S3	-Auuu, au.	Fetches two toy sauce pans and plays as if feeding M3.
11	M3	-Ah, give food to mommie!	Acts out the play with S3.
12	M3	-Want pacifier?	Searches for pacifier and gives it to S3.
13	S3	-No.	Gives the pacifier back to M3.
SCENE 3			
14	M3	-Is it Mickey Mouse?	Asks S3 and looks at TV set.
15	S3	-Hum?	Plays with connecting parts and watches the cartoon.
16	M3	-Is TV more important?	Speaks softly.
17	S3	-Hum...Tud.	Points to the TV set.
18	M3	-Is it Tudus? Yes...	
SCENE 4			
19	S3	-Mom! Sisi...	Plays with balls.
20	M3	-What, sweetie? The mother did not understand.	
21	S3	-Ah, ahhh...	Smiles and plays with balls.
22	M3	-Throw the ball. Booom!	Throws the ball at S3.
23	S3	-Boo.	Runs towards the ball.
24	M3	-Want motorbike?	Puts the toy in position.
25	S3	-Uuuhh...	Rides motorbike with M3's help.

Figure 5 - Interaction scenes and Dialog between M3 and S3

At scene 2, it was observed that the mother proposes some play and child responds by taking the turn (line 2). This was the first enunciation mechanism of combination of I-You and separation of I/You (strategy II). Then, even though the mother changed the referent (from the proposed play to the plane) the child continues to respond to the mother (first mechanism, strategy I), and keeps saying you in the speech of I, where she utters “ão” (“will do”, in Portuguese, line 4), a strategy that relates to the verbal co-reference mechanism. At scene 2, at first, the dialog between M3 and S3 is not in line (lines 5-7). Next, the I (S3) makes requests to the you (M3) (line 8), where the first enunciative mechanism can be found (strategy III). It is noteworthy that when the interaction between M3 and S3 is in line (lines

8-11), M3 changes the referent when she offers the “pacifier” to S3 (line 12), but S3 uses a deitic mark to establish herself in speech by refusing her mother’s offer by saying “no” (line 13).

What is evident at scene 3 is the first mechanism and strategy II, in which television (lines 14-18) is shown to be a routine structure in their family for the self that fills its place of enunciation with gestures and utterances. S3 marks her symbolic introduction into language when she uses co-references in the “you” speech, which she does by bringing up “Tud” (Tudus) (line 17), referring to a character in Mickey Mouse’s cartoon mentioned by M3 (line 14) (second enunciative mechanism, strategy II), and M3 understands what was said by the child and repeats it correctly (line 18).

At scene 4, in line 19, S3 refers to the other (first mechanism, strategy III). However, M3 does not understand the request (line 20) (second mechanism b). The dialog flows again, but again M3 changes the referent and offers S3 the “Motoca” (“motorbike” in Portuguese, line 24). It is understood that S3 is still highly dependent on the words of the other, which is actually more evident in the first enunciative mechanism. Even though M3 does not keep a continuous dialog with S3, she tries to engage in what is brought up by her mother. These issues confirm the difficulties observed in that case, that is, M3 refrains from separating from her daughter, and no space is left in discourse for the daughter to take ownership of her speech.

Figure 6 reports some scenes between P3 and S3.

The first scene already shows the difficulty of interaction between F3 and S3, because S3 constantly searches for her mother throughout the scene (lines 4, 6 and 8). F3 makes multiple requests in an attempt to engage the child in interaction (lines 7, 9, 10 and 12); however, S3 seeks her mother (line 13) and does not engage in a dialog with her father. At scene 2, F3 continues to try to interact with S3 (line 14) and she refuses to respond to his request (line 15) stating “nuuu” (line 15), thereby marking herself deictically in speech and addressing her mother, perhaps because S3 considers her mother a better source of comfort. Finally, S3 engages in F3 proposed play (line 18) by accepting it (line 19), and she repeats using “you” in the speech of “I” (second mechanism, strategy IV); however, S3 shows little interest in his request and continues watching TV.

At scene 3, there is more harmony between F3 and S3, although very closely associated with the TV set. In line 22, F3 shows the cartoon to his daughter and begins to sing, and S3 quickly engages dialog with her father and begins to sing (line 23) (first mechanism, strategy II); however, S3 suddenly begins to worry about her mother’s absence and interrupts the dialog with F3 (line 27). It is evident, also in this case, that it is difficult to extend the process of linguistic ownership with multiple interlocutors other than her mother alone. Again, semantization language, understood as a process that should be extended to different interlocutors who live with the child, is limited, probably due to the difficulties of separation of mother-child as evidenced from IRDIs.

■ DISCUSSION

Considering the results of the survey, it is noticed, in general, that in all three cases that it is difficult for the child to separate from her mother, and that

this is reflected in the process of semantization of language, especially in the expansion of possible interlocutors. The three children showed the possibility of semiotic domain of language, considering that the three enunciative mechanisms³ are present during the verbal and nonverbal interactions. Also, various enunciative strategies are used in fostering dialog between parents and children. Depending on the logical structure provided by the author in the emergence of such mechanisms, the first two mechanisms are clearly more often observed in the analyzed scenes while the third mechanism is still incipient. However, it is noteworthy that the third mechanism may be less developed in view of the aforementioned difficulty of expanding the number of interlocutors and limitation of the socialization process in most of these children, associated with the difficulty in separating from the mother. This could be seen when the three children did not keep long dialogs with their fathers, repeatedly seeking interaction with their mothers.

The relationship between language and psyche is corroborated in the field of psychoanalysis, as some evidence of the appearance or not of language can contribute to the early detection of children with difficulties in the psychic constitution process¹⁰. However, what this article seeks is to demonstrate that it is not just the emergence or lack of emergence of language, but what it is like as a consequence of constitution. The children in this study did not demonstrate any biological limit to language acquisition, considering the semiotic field of language shown by them; however, a restriction was observed in the semantization process, relative to who can fill in the place of you.

Furthermore, establishing oneself in language by taking the turn, i.e. establishing as a subject, is the ability to separate oneself and take a different position, which requires to break off the satisfaction contained in the symbiotic mother-child relationship. In this sense, language is a way of withstanding the absence of the Other, of making their presence last and replacing the object. Thus, language is here understood as an activity that arises in intersubjectivity and, in the process, the two partners are involved and mingle, change positions, transitivize, meet and separate, as well as share a particular language¹¹.

The mechanisms required for protoconversation were present in the father-child interactions, and fathers assumed that children were capable of stating something, thus considering their utterances as statements. Based on this process, the child is expected to request the participation of the other by recognizing what pleases the other while enunciating.

Line	Interlocutor	Verbal manifestations	Comments on context or intonation
SCENE 1			
1	P3	-Let's play with ball? Kick, kick, goal, goal.	F3 is on the floor. He gives S3 the ball for kicks.
2	S3		Grabs the ball and kicks it forward.
3	P3	-Get the ball, kick, kick...	Takes the ball in hand and throws it near S3.
SCENE 2			
4	S3	-Eee!	Mom arrives; S3 takes her hand for support and kicks the ball.
5	P3	-Come to daddy, run!	Squats and opens his arms to S3.
6	S3	-Mom, mommie....	Points to the TV set. Looks excited.
7	P3	-Where? Where?	Fetches S3 and faces the TV set.
8	S3	-liiiihh...	Claps and smiles as she watches her favorite cartoon character.
9	P3	-Tudus", sweetie? Oh Tudus, cool!	She speaks softly.
10	P3	-Let's get down and play. Get the ball and throw it at daddy!	Puts S3 back on the ground and throws the ball.
11	S3	-Huum...	Goes towards M3 but then fetches the ball and plays with F3.
12	P3	-daddy gets the ball....	Fetches the ball that S3 threw further away.
13	S3	-Mom, mommie..	Takes her mother's hand and goes to the room.
SCENE 3			
14	P3	-Daddy, take it, come, come...	Walks to the room but unaware of S3's request.
15	S3	-Nuuu...	Walks to M3 in tears, takes her hand and takes her to the room.
16	P3	- See? She wants the remote control. She wants to turn on the TV set.	Speaks in an unsurprised tone about S3's reaction.
17	S3	-Aaaahh, ah, ah!	Sits on the bedroom floor and watches TV. M# had turned on the TV set.
18	P3	-Play with the little car, here. Do it like: brun, brun, brummm.	Leaves the toy car in the bed and mimics how to play with it.
19	S3	-Bummm, bummm...	Plays with the car while watches TV.
SCENE 4			
20	P3	-Daddy switches channels. Let's watch "Pocoio"?	Switches channels.
21	S3	-Oh.	Pays attention to cartoon, smiles at F3 and feels more relaxed to watch the cartoons.
22	P3	-The one you like!	Sings and dances to the song on the cartoon.
23	S3	-U, dos...	Sings and dances while watching the cartoon, which is about numbers and play.
24	P3	-"I'll sing and count, I'll sing and count up to teeeeen".	Sings the cartoon song and takes S3's hand and dances with her.
25	S3	-liiihh, iihh...Uuhh...	Dances with F3 and sings (unintelligible) at the sound of music.
26	P3	-Over!	F3 stands up when the cartoon is over.
27	S3	-Moom...	S3 also stands up and walks towards M3's lap.

Figure 6 - Interaction Scenes and Dialog between P3 and S3

First, the place that the child occupies in the utterance is assigned by the other, i.e., it is spoken by the other; so that, thereafter, the child can enunciate by herself³. In the cases analyzed, the limitation seems to lie in the expansion of the place of the other. It is restricted to the mother and strategies of the third mechanism may be reduced, as a result, because the non separation from the mother's body prevents the child from breaking off the initial dependence on her speech.

Thus, this study considered the specific aspects of each case and the enunciative situation, because in the theoretical approach adopted, it is not believed that language can be investigated without considering the speaker-interlocutor interaction and the enunciative context. I-You are reversible roles in the interaction, since the way each interlocutor grasps the language and establishes the *alocutário* at the moment forever "present" seems to define the apprehension in another "present" (the afterwards), just like in the enunciative approach, the object of study includes the subject, so the use of language is always unique and unrepeatable. Thus, one must consider the data on acquisition in a framework of singularity, which encompasses the subject's relationship to the "other" and their use of language at every enunciative act³.

It is known that a child speech indicates that she entered into a field that supersedes that of speech: the field of language, which includes expressive manifestations but is not limited to them. However, a child's introduction into the language field is not measured only by the vocabulary, the mastery of syntax and grammar or any other manifestations of language, such as gestures. Your entry corresponds to the place of which the subject is in the language system, revealing his ability to lie in relation to the meanings of the world, their ability to sustain relationships with others, to recognize the language the demand and desire of others and thereby producing new meanings⁵. It's when a guy takes speech as a resource, he can use it to express their will and their own desires¹².

Accordingly, in cases observed is exactly in this context that can be outlining a constraint on the development of these three children because, although there is the assumption of a subject, he is not supposed to separate from the mother. Clearly there is also the idea of children as announcers able to maintain the enunciation, as mothers and fathers can establish their demands and desires from a fill shift or attuned to signs of S1, S2 and S2 responses. However, the enunciative scenes reveal that what is forbidden is the entrance of the paternal function, revealed the impossibility of a person other than parent-child be part of the

dialog. This restriction can only be understood when the enunciative scenes analyzed included the significant actors in a situation of dialog, thus respecting the principle of intersubjectivity as a principle of analysis in the assessment of the functioning of language development in children.

Similarly, when analyzing the semiotic and semantic levels, it is observed that the form-meaning relationship is underway, including the progressive mastery of the linguistic system, suitable in terms of logic of enunciative mechanisms based on the proposed enunciative³. There is, however, a limitation in the interlocution process which could not be detected by simply looking into the mastery of the language system in the traditional way, i.e., in the view traditionally used in the analysis of children's speech productions as mastery semantic, syntactic, phonological morphological and pragmatic aspects. It would not be possible to understand that there is a limitation in the operation of language of the three subjects and that it may be limiting the progressive mastery of more complex enunciative mechanisms and the process of appropriation of discourse, whereby these children should increasingly and creatively establish themselves discursively.

It is understood that the difficulties in mother-infant separation and the fragility of paternal participation obstructed the child's position in the language, because for speech production requires the subject to take a place in discourse, and also the infant to separate from the Other in otherness. Monitoring these 18-month-old children showed that there the babies were assumed as subjects, from the beginning, as the parents talked about future plans for their child (symbolic reference), interpreted their child's actions and sounds as a demand and a request for help. Thus, they spoke words (in babytalk tone¹³) to their babies assuming they were talking to a subject (and not just a body) that was able to understand their speech and have a say.

Moreover, in this process, the three children sought to occupy that place proposed by parents by taking their place in the dialog and in other pleasing them with their productions, no longer reflexive, as were the first sounds, cries and movements. However, difficulties in the three cases began to emerge when parents (unintentionally) could not sustain the interruption of the paternal function¹⁴, implying a loss of satisfaction for parents and child, which involves the establishment of rules, limits, rates of eating and sleeping, weaning and tolerance of maternal absence; issues that are essential for the emergence of a subject, no longer adhered to the Other, but able to articulate in their own name and express their own desires.

■ CONCLUSION

The study showed that the enunciative relationships between parents and children investigated in this study had characteristics that are possibly associated with the interruption of the paternal function as prohibitive of the mother-infant relationship. It was observed from the interactional scenes, the subjects showed semiotic language proficiency, as well as various enunciative strategies present in the dialogs. The third mechanism

proposed by Carmen Silva³ was the most limited one, because children still showed to be quite dependent on their parents' speech to produce their own. It was noticed that there is a major expansion in the processes of separation aimed at other interlocutors, which are believed to relate to the mother-child separation difficulty. It was also possible to observe the relevance of the principles of intersubjectivity and the form-meaning relationship so as to propose a hypothesis of language functioning of the triads analyzed.

RESUMO

Objetivo: investigar as relações enunciativas estabelecidas entre pais e crianças com risco ao desenvolvimento infantil, sobretudo, os efeitos da presença do risco no processo de aquisição da linguagem. **Métodos:** a amostra constituiu o estudo de três crianças que apresentaram risco ao desenvolvimento, acompanhadas de 0 a 18 meses a partir dos Indicadores de Risco ao Desenvolvimento Infantil, bem como, por filmagens da interação dos pais com as crianças. A análise dos dados considerou a perspectiva enunciativa proposta por Carmen Silva (2007, 2009) e a psicanalítica. **Resultados:** nos três casos constatou-se dificuldade de separação da mãe com a criança o que refletiu no processo de semantização da língua, sobretudo, na ampliação dos possíveis interlocutores. Contudo, os sujeitos evidenciaram a possibilidade de domínio semiótico da língua tendo em vista que os três mecanismos enunciativos propostos por Silva (2007). **Conclusões:** o estudo evidenciou que as dificuldades de separação mãe-bebê e a fragilidade da entrada da função paterna obstaculizaram a posição da criança na língua, uma vez que as crianças mostraram-se bastante dependentes da fala dos pais para suas produções.

DESCRITORES: Desenvolvimento Infantil; Linguagem; Relações Pai-Filho; Relações Mãe-Filho

■ REFERENCES

1. Motta S. Psicopatologia e clínica no primeiro ano de vida. In: Org Oliveira EFL, Ferreira SS, Barreto TA. As interfaces da clínica com bebês. Recife: NINAR - Núcleo de Estudos Psicanalíticos, 2009. p. 27-49.
2. Vives J. A pulsão invocante e os destinos da voz. *Psicanálise & Barroco em revista*. 2009;7(1):186-202.
3. Silva CLC. A criança na linguagem: enunciação e aquisição. São Paulo: Pontes, 2009.
4. Flores MR, Beltrami L, Ramos APS. O manhês e suas implicações para a constituição do sujeito na linguagem. *Distúrbios da Comunicação*. 2011;23(2):143-52.
5. Kupfer MCM, Jerusalinsky AN, Bernardino LMF, Wanderley D, Rocha PSB, Molina SE et al. Valor preditivo de indicadores clínicos de risco para o desenvolvimento infantil: um estudo a partir da teoria psicanalítica. In *Lat. Am. Journal of Fund. Psychopath.* Online. 2009;6(1):48-68. Disponível em: http://www.psicopatologiafundamental.org/uploads/files/latin_american/v6_n1/valor_preditivo_de_indicadores_clinicos_de_risco_para_o_desenvolvimento_infantil.pdf. Acesso em: 28 nov. 2011.
6. Rechia IC, Ramos APS. Dialogia e função materna em casos de limitações práxicas verbais. *Psicologia em Estudo*. 2010;15(2):315-23.
7. Crestani AH, Ramos APS, Beltrami L, Morais AB. Análise da associação entre tipos de aleitamento, presença de risco ao desenvolvimento infantil, variáveis obstétricas e socioeconômicas. *J. Soc Bras Fonoaudiol*. 2012. No prelo.
8. Moro MP, Ramos APS. Três análises de linguagem no autismo. *Rev CEFAC* [Online]. 2011;13(5):944-55. Disponível em: ISSN 1982-0216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1516-18462010005000073>. Acesso em: 28 nov. 2011.

9. Pesquisa multicêntrica de indicadores clínicos de risco para o desenvolvimento infantil. 2008. Disponível em: http://fmcsv.org.br/pdf/FMCSV_pesquisa_multicentrica_indicadores_cl%C3%ADnicos_DI.pdf. Acesso em: 16 out. 2011.
10. Wanderley DB. A entrada do bebê no mundo da linguagem e sua relação com o outro parental. *Revista Psicanálise e Clínica de Bebês*. 2000;4(4):53-61.
11. Pesaro ME. Alcances e limites teóricos-metodológicos da pesquisa multicêntrica de indicadores clínicos de risco para o desenvolvimento infantil [Tese]. São Paulo: Programa de pós-graduação em Psicologia: Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo; 2010.
12. Pereira AS, Keske-Soares M. Significação parental acerca do desvio fonológico. *Psicologia em Estudo*. 2009;14(4):787-95.
13. Socha A. A função especular da voz materna e suas referências ao psiquismo e à constituição do si mesmo. *Winnicott e-Prints*. 2008;3(1/2):1-12.
14. Bernardino LMF. A criança como mestre do gozo da família atual: desdobramentos da "pesquisa de indicadores clínicos de risco para o desenvolvimento infantil". *Revista Mal-estar e subjetividade*. 2008;8(3):661-80.

Received on: May 01, 2012
Accepted on: January 23, 2013

Mailing address:
Mariana Rodrigues Flores
Av. Roraima, 1000 - Camobi
Universidade Federal de Santa Maria
Santa Maria - RS - Brasil
CEP: 97105-900
E-mail: mari.rflores@hotmail.com