GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE OF A 3;6-YEAR-OLD BOY: A CASE STUDY

[1]Sigit Suharjono, [2]Dewi Ratnaningsih
[1]sigit.suharjono67@gmail.com, [1]dewi.ratnaningsih@umko.ac.id

[1,2]Universitas Muhammadiyah Kotabumi

Abstrak: *Indonesia. Kompetensi gramatikal anak umur 3.6 tahun: Studi kasus. Pemerolehan tata bahasa anak tidak selalu mulus tanpa kesalahan. Sangat sering anak-anak menghasilkan ucapan yang tidak ditemukan dalam ucapan orang dewasa dan dianggap sebagai kesalahan. Kesalahan ini sering tidak dapat diperbaiki, yaitu, anak-anak terus mengulangi kesalahan yang sama meskipun koreksi oleh orang dewasa berulang kali diberikan. Penelitian tentang kompetensi gramatikal anak selama ini difokuskan pada jenis kesalahan yang dilakukan anak. Tulisan ini bertujuan untuk mengungkap kompetensi gramatikal seorang anak laki-laki berusia 3;6 tahun dengan berfokus pada jenis kalimat yang dia sudah dapat produksi dan mendeskripsikan seperti apa kalimat tersebut. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa empat jenis kalimat terjadi sepanjang ucapan yang diproduksi anak dan sebagian besar berstruktur pernyataan dengan mengubah pola intonasi. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa anak umur 3;6 tahun, sebagai subyek penleitina ini, dapat memproduksi semua jenis kalimat sebagian besarnya dengan cara mengubah pola intonasinya.*

Kata kunci: *pemerolehan bahasa, anak, kompetensi gramatikal, perubahan intonasi, jenis kalimat*

Abstract: The child's acquisition of grammar is not always smooth without errors. Very often children produce utterances that are not found in the adult's and are considered as errors. These errors are frequently uncorrectable, that is, children keep repeating the same errors although corrections by adults are repeatedly provided. Researches on children's grammatical competence have so far been focused on the types of errors children make. This paper aimed to reveal the grammatical competence of a 3;6-year-old boy by focusing on what types of sentences he could already produce and describing what the sentence were like. The result revealed that the four types of sentence category were ubiquitous in the child utterances and that most of them were structured in the way of statements with alterations of intonation patterns. To conclude, the 3;6-year-old boy, being the subject of the research, was capable of producing all types of sentences mostly by altering the pattern of intonations.

Keywords: children, grammatical competence, intonation alterations, language acquisition, sentence types

INTRODUCTION

There has been a clear consent among many scholars that language development

is driven by innate capacities and shaped by the environment. Though many scholars also differ in their views on the nature of the innate mechanisms, as well as the influence degree of environments, any explanation must take into account the fact that the grammar children acquire is not determined by the linguistic input they receive. This has been made clear by the evidence that children's language is colored with many constructions as well as vocabulary (found in English speaking children) that have never been taught to them (Hyams & Orfitelli, 2014; Ma et al., 2009).

Children's language competence development is always interesting in that, for example, they are exposed to only a limited number of adult utterances, yet they have the ability to produce and understand more than what they are exposed to, including a large number of adult utterances that are not grammatical. Every naturally growing child develops a rich and highly abstract system of rules that governs the grammar of their language (Hyams & Orfitelli, 2014). They come at this point in a very short period despite the absence of explicit correction, instruction, or information about ungrammaticality from adults. In addition, much of what they come to know is not explicitly exemplified in the adults' language around them.

The child's way to the acquisition of grammar does not go smoothly without

errors. In fact, their productions very often deviate from those of the adult's in a way that they feel easy and intelligible. These errors, like most other aspects of children's developing grammar, are resistant to correction, that is, children keep repeating the same errors although corrections by adults are frequently provided.

Numerous studies have been conducted to address the issues of children's acquisition of verbs (Choi & Gopnik, 1995; Ma et al., 2009) nouns (Colombo et al., 2017; D'Odorico & Fasolo, 2007; Kauschke et al., 2011) and grammar (Hyams & Orfitelli, 2014; Ma et al., 2009; Paradis & Genesee, 1996). However, to the best of the author's knowledge, few researches have addressed types of sentences children in early language development are able to produce and communicate and what the sentence structures are like. It is for this reason that the present study, therefore, aims to describe the grammatical competence of a child of 3;6 years of age in terms of what types of sentences a child of 3;6 can possibly produce and communicate. In addition, it also aims to describe what the sentence structures are like.

In an attempt to find out the grammatical structures of children sentences, Bloom (1990) investigated the transcripts of Adam and Sarah between the ages of 2;3 and 2;7 for subject and object

omissions. The two children indicated omissions of both subject and object but with a lower rate for object omissions (7% to 15%) than for subject omissions (43% to 61%). Loeb & Leonard (1991) also investigated the grammaticality of children's language focusing on the case pronoun errors in children utterances. They took eight children aged between 2;11 and 3;4. Their study revealed that five of the children produced subject pronouns with at least 90% accuracy, and one child showed an accuracy rate of 62%. The other two children demonstrated low accuracy rates of 36% and 31%. The errors tended to be replacement of object case pronouns for subject case pronouns (e.g. him for he). Similar study by Moore, (2001) reported the correct use for third person singular pronouns averaging 71% in 12 children of 3;0 to 3;8, with a higher average accuracy rate for 'he' (83%) than for 'she' (49%).

The span and complexity of children's utterances develop quickly, and a wide range of structures comes to paint their everyday language in a matter of months. O'Grady, (2011) notices some common phenomena in the early grammatical development of an English-speaking child, some of which are negation, pronoun-drop, inversion in wh- questions and passives.

Children's earliest negation patterns are *no* or *not* which are used pre-verbally as in *No have it, Mommy* or in *She not going.* O'Grady, (2011) notices that during the "root infinitive stage"—a period around 2 years of age, negatives connect with verbal inflection in an captivating way, in which agreement and tense marking is optional. The pattern of preverbal negation as in the example above (*She not going* and *No have it, Mommy*) seems to be limited to non-finite verb forms, for children do not say *She not goes* (Wexler, 1996).

Another noticeable feature of early multi-word utterances of English-speaking children is the common absence of subjects such as in *helping Mommy* or in *no turn.* Even so, according to Valian as cited in O'Grady (2011), subject drop is significantly less often in English-speaking children than are in children speaking languages such as Italian and Chinese since the two languages thereof have the so-called "plus" setting of the pro-drop (pronoun-drop) parameter of Universal Grammar. Bromberg & Wexler (1995) explains that pro-drop suggests a correlation with finiteness that is usually found in wh- questions, in which null subjects seem to co-occur almost unequivocally with root infinitives as in *Where go?* and not *Where goes?**

Inversions in wh- questions are often found to be wrongly employed by English-speaking children in their early language development. Klima and Bellugi as cited in

O'Grady (2011) reported that in child language, subject-auxiliary inversion fails to occur in wh questions in spite of its systematic use in yes-no questions. That is to say that children are able to make a yes-no question with the auxiliary preceding the subject, but fails to do so when producing wh- questions. For example, a child can correctly say *Can I have candy?* but they incorrectly say *What he can ride in?* Such a tendency is especially widespread in questions with *why* as in *why that boy is looking at us?*

Passives patterns are also problematic to English-speaking children but not to children speaking Indonesian and some other languages. In the Indonesian language, passives are acquired earlier than its active counterparts due to the fact that most Indonesian adults tend to employ passives in their everyday language (Dardjowidjojo, 2000). This is also the case in Sesotho (Demuth, 2015) Quiche Mayan (Pye & Poz as cited in O'Grady, 2011)) that passive is used productively before the age of 3.

Unlike in the aforementioned languages, passive patterns in English (e.g. The cat was chased by the dog) are mastered later than active patterns (e.g. The dog chased the cat), either in comprehension or production, with errors continuing until the age of 6 or even later (O'Grady, 2011). He also explained that

passives without by-phrase (agentless) are easier than those with a by-phrase.

METHOD

The subject of this research was Nareshwara, a boy of 3;6 years of age, who was the researcher's youngest son. Nareswara started talking (only one-word utterances) at the age of two, a bit late than all his brothers and anybody else who generally start to talk between the age of 12 to 18 months (Marjanovič-Umek et al., 2013). The data was recorded in natural settings—without the boy knowing it—when he was talking/playing alone or with his brother(s) or during his togetherness with the researcher. There were 6 recordings which were taken separately in the time span of two months from beginning of April to the end of May 2020. The interval of one to another recording averaged one week; that is to give enough time to see the child's language development. The data was then transcribed and analyzed by identifying the sentences and categorizing them into their types based on Eastwood (2002) categorization: statements, questions, imperatives and exclamations. The categorization into the four types thereof also employed intonation analysis whether a sentence belongs to a question, statement, imperative or

exclamation. The utterances were also analyzed based on their elements and structure to describe what the sentence structures were like. That is to say, whether the sentences had complete elements and whether the elements were structured in the right order according to the standard form of the subject's language—Bahasa Indonesia. The data in this analysis was taken only from one recording (the first recording) which was taken on April 5, 2020. This was under consideration that the data was found to have represented all types of sentence category by Eastwood (2002).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The data showed that the subject had developed a breadth of linguistic competence. Not only did the subject show a large number of vocabulary, but he also showed his ability to produce the four types of sentences as categorized by Eastwood (2002)—statements, questions, imperatives, and exclamations. In terms of vocabulary, despite his imperfect pronunciation, the subject had already acquired a very unique word, *siratop* (meaning the triceratops of the dinosaurs), that the researcher himself (and maybe many other people) did not know before. Relating to the sentence types, the four types as mentioned above were observed to

have existed in many utterances of the child's. Many of the utterances were answers prompted by his brother's questions and some others resulted from the child's own reactions to certain situations (excerpt 1) and curiosity (excerpt 2). In excerpt 1, for example, the subject reacted to what his brother did to the figure the subject had drawn on the ground, and in excerpt 2 the subject was curious to know what his father was drawing on the ground.

Excerpt 1 (*italics* = Indonesian; English = author's own translation)

Transcript		English Translation
Nareswara :	*Iiih jangan diancurin*	Hey! Don't destroy!
Brother :	*Enggak diancurin. Tadi itu bilang Mamas giniin lagi*	Not Destroying. Brother said to do like this again.

Excerpt 2 (*italics* = Indonesian; English = author's own translation)

Transcript		English Translation

Nareswara: *Buat* Making
apa, what, Dad?
Abi?

Father : *Heh?* Huh?

Nareswara: *Buat* Making
apa what?!
sih? Daddy's
Abi making
mau animal?
buat
hewan?

Moreover, the data also indicated that the subject was able to construct well-structured statements, questions, and imperatives following the standard of the Indonesian language as demonstrated in some of the utterances. For example, in turn number 27 (see the transcript in appendix 1) the subject said *Aku mau buat rumah kayak gini* (I want to make a house like this) whose structure follows S + V + O + C. Further findings and discussions are presented in the following sections.

Statements

Eastwood (2002) categorizes sentences into this type based on its function which is to give information. This type of a sentence, according to K12Reader, is also classified as a declarative (K12Reader, n.d.). The transcription from the first recording used in this analysis resulted 100 utterances, 58 of which belonged to the category of statements, which consisted of 12 negative and 46 positive statements (see

appendix 2). Some of the statements only consisted of one element as a response to a question. Many of single elements in this category are subjects as in *Siratop* (triceratops, appendix 1, turn 46) which is a response to a question *Hewan apa Dek?*(What animal, Brother?). Some are only verbs as in *Punya* (Have, turn 15) which is a response to a question *Punya kaca nggak?*(Have any glass or not?)

The structures of the statements were found to vary. Statements with more complete elements were noticed to be inclined to the standard structure of Indonesian language. For example, the subject was observed to produce an SVOC construction as in *Aku mau buat rumah kayak gini* (I want to make a house like this) and an S+Neg+VO as in *Rumah kita nggak punya perut* (Our house does not have a stomach). In addition, the statements also consisted of two elements that varied in the elements themselves and the structures. Most consisted of a subject and complement (which is not possible in English without the presence of a verb after

the subject). The following table describes the variation of structures and elements in two-element statements found in the child's utterances.

Table 1. Two-element constructions

No	Structure/Element	Example	Translation
	S + C	*Kacanya di sini* *Siratop itu hewan*	The glass ---here Triceratops --- animals
	V + O	*Buat rumah*	Making a house
	S + V	*Saya injek*	I stamp
	Neg + Verb	*Nggak ada*	Doesn't have

Imperatives

EnglishSentence.com defines imperative sentence as the one that basically gives instructions, requests, or demands (EnglishSentences.com, n.d.). Eastwood (2002) explains that from the perspective of structure, the imperative is the base form of the verb with its negative counterpart consisting of **do not/don't + base form**. Out of 100 utterances, there

were 5 imperatives in the child's utterances, which were expressed in different structures and elements. One-element imperative was found to consist of a subject only as in *Abi!* (Dad!). This utterance is classified as imperative since in this utterance the child called out to his father asking him to see and listen to him. Two-element imperatives were found to be composed of V + S and Neg + V as in *Coba Abi* (Try Daddy!) and in *Jangan diancurin* (Don't destroy) respectively. Longer imperatives were found to consist of S + Neg + V + O in *Abi jangan injek rumah saya* (Daddy don't stamp my house) and S + V + C + Adv. in *Abi buat kayak gini juga* meaning Daddy make (something) like this too. The last example was categorized as imperative, for in it the child implies his insistence that his father make something like he did.

Questions

Eastwood (2002) identifies questions from the function, which is to ask for information. Questions are basically classified into two: the one that only requires *yes/no* response and the other, well-known as **Wh-questions,** that requires certain answer. Based on the data, there were 16 questions out of 100 utterances, and most of the questions were expressed in the structure of a statement with an

intonation typically of a question and with (some of them) an additional particle such as *ya* and *kan* at the end that is similar to 'right' used as a tag. The Wh-questions employed by the subject were still limited to *what, who, where, which, why,* and *how.* Very often they were placed after verb in the position of object or complement with or without the presence of a subject. The subject was never observed to employ 'when' in his questions.This might indicate that the acquisition of time expressions is more difficult because they are abstract.

The use of wh- question after verb is ubiquitous in the child's utterances. In one occasion when I was making a call on my cellphone, the subject asked *Abi telpon sapa?* meaning 'Abi (Daddy) is calling who?' Also when I was well-dressed and ready to go, he asked *Abi mau pergi kemana?* (Abi is going where?). This ubiquity of wh-questions after verb, however, was not an indication of the child's inability to form fronted wh-questions, for the child was also observed to employ fronted wh- questions in some occasions, especially with *what, who, where* and (rarely) *how.* A noticeable characteristic of such fronted wh- questions in the child's utterances was that the question did not employ a verb and that the subject was a demonstrative pronoun/adjective. Very often the subject was heard to ask such questions as 'Apa

itu?', "Sapa itu?" and "Gimana ni?" respectively meaning "what is that?", "who is that?", and "how is it?" In these questions the subjects are all demonstrative pronouns with no verb involved in the predicate.

Questions that involved verbs were structured like statements with commonly additional particles such as *ya*, and *kan* at the end (as explained above) functioning like 'right' at the end of English statements as tags. Moreover, yes/no questions are all structured like statements.Table 2 below shows various types and structures of questions by the research subject found in the transcript data.

Table 2. Types and strucures of questions

No	Questions	Translation
1.	*Rumah itu gak punya tangan, kan?*	Houses don't have hands, right?
2.	*Apa itu ubabah?*	What is ubabah?
3.	*Dimana tadi?*	Where was it?
4.	*Abi pake golok itu, ya?*	Abi is using that chopper, yes?
5.	*Abi mau buat hewan?*	Abi wants to make an animal?
6.	*Mau gambar apa itu?*	Want to draw what?

7. *Abi   ini   Abi this is the
   pintunya ya?*   door, yes?

8. *Ini untuk*   This is for what,
   apanya Bi?   Dad?

Exclamations

Exclamatory sentences may consist of a single verb, or they can be more lengthy and complex (https://englishsentences.com/types-of-sentences/). Eastwood (2002) characterizes an exclamation as a sentence spoken with emphasis and feeling. EnglishSentence.com explains that exclamatory sentences express strong emotion—no matter what the emotion is, which to some extent can be like imperatives. Employing this definition may risk wrong categorization of imperatives and exclamations if based on the written data only. Thus, audio data that showed how the utterances were expressed had to be taken more into account.

The exclamations in the data were categorized not based on the structure but more on the intonation that expressed the child's feeling and emotion—being angry, upset, satisfied, happy, etc. Based on this, the data resulted 16 exclamations, some of which consisted of only one element—interjection/exclamation—that was more a scream expressing a sudden physical pain such as *Auh!* (Ouch!) or disappointment such as *Aah!* Some others consisted of two or more elements that were more like imperatives such as *Liat dianya (binatang mainan) takut!* (Look it's—toy animal—afraid!). In this case, the child did not ask his brother to see that the toy animal was afraid, but rather he wanted to show his brother that he was able to make the animal afraid. In another case an exclamation may look like a statement when seen from the structure. For example, the dialog in excerpt 3 was triggered by the child's brother who kept asking whether a house had some parts like human body organs such as mouth, head, hand, etc. In his effort to convince his brother that it did not have such organs, he asked his father. When his father confirmed that it did not, he finally said *Tuuh, nggak punya!* (Right, don't have!) to his brother. From the structure, it was more like a negative statement in that it was composed of a negative + verb. However, in that utterance, the subject showed his happiness that he was right, and that his brother was wrong. This is the reason why it was categorized as exclamation. Excerpt 3 below describes how the dialog ran.

Excerpt 3 (*Italics* = Indonesian; Normal font = English translation by author; ***Italics bold*** = exclamation)

Speaker	Text	Translation
Nareswara:	*Abi!*	Daddy!
Father :	*Ya, Nak.*	Yes, son.
Nareswara:	*Rumah itu ga punya tangan kan?*	Houses don't have hands, right?
Father :	*Enggak lah*	No, of course
Nareswara:	*Nggak punya kaki juga?*	Have no legs either, right?
Father :	*Nggak punya*	Don't have
Nareswara:	**Tuuuh Nggak punya.!**	**See?!, don't have!**

Nonsense Words

One interesting finding in this research was the fact that the research subject was observed to produce several nonsense words, which covered 5 percent (5 words) of the overall number of utterances in this research. Three of these— *Eito! Huicong! Hiyuuhoo!*—were expressed as screams of spirit, and the other two (*obaba,* and *atobati*) were expressed like singing. This finding confirms Hyam's and Ortifelli's (2014) research that children

may produce language that have never been taught to them.

CONCLUSION

Linguistic development of a child is amazing as well as unpredictable in terms of what a child at certain age has already acquired. Children differ one from another. In certain cases, a child might already acquire vocabulary that most adults might not know such as the word *siratop* (meaning triceratops of the dinosaurs) in this research. The researcher himself did not recognize 'triceratopses' before. Relating to grammatical competence—the ability to produce various types of sentences—of the research subject, who was 3;6 years at the time of observation, the data revealed that the research subject had already been able to produce all four types of sentences as categorized by Eastwood (2002) which covered statements, imperatives, questions, and exclamations. The four types of sentences were expressed in various structures. Even so, one salient thing in this research was that most of the sentences were expressed in the structure of statements with alterations of intonation patterns. Thus, it indicated that the research subject—a boy of 3;6 years—relied more on intonation in messaging various meanings and intentions. Many of them

consisted of two elements with two or three words or of only one element/word that could be subject, verb, object, adverb, or complement only. Some of the sentences contained complete elements, indicating that the subject of the research had completely acquired his grammatical competence (in terms of sentence types and structures).

The result of this research, however, only describes the grammatical competence of a 3;6 year old boy , but not with a girl. Since there have been claim of differences in language development of different sexes (Adani & Cepanec, 2019), a research on the grammatical competence of a girl of the same age, thus, needs to be conducted to see the difference of a language development between boys and girls.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adani, S., & Cepanec, M. (2019). Sex differences in early communication development: Behavioral and neurobiological indicators of more vulnerable communication system development in boys. *Croatian Medical Journal*, *60*(2), 141–149. https://doi.org/10.3325/cmj.2019.60.141

Bloom, P. (1990). Subjectless Sentences in Child Language. *Linguistic Inquiry*, *21*(4), 491–504.

Bromberg, H. S., & Wexler, K. (1995). Null Subjects in child Wh-questions. *Papers on Language Processing and Aquisition*, 221–247.

Choi, S., & Gopnik, A. (1995). Early acquisition of verbs in korean: A cross-linguistic study. In *Journal of Child Language* (Vol. 22, Issue 3). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900009934

Colombo, L., Navarrete, E., & Arfé, B. (2017). Acquisition of nouns and verbs in Italian pre-school children. In *Journal of Child Language* (Vol. 44, Issue 6). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000916000593

D'Odorico, L., & Fasolo, M. (2007). Nouns and verbs in the vocabulary acquisition of Italian children. *Journal of Child Language*, *34*(4), 891–907. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000907008240

Dardjowidjojo, S. (2000). *Echa: Kisah pemerolehan bahasa anak Indonesia*. Grasindo.

Demuth, K. (2015). Maturation and the acquisition of the Sesotho passive. *Linguistic Society of America Is*, *65*, 56–80. https://doi.org/10.2307/4341113

Eastwood, J. (2002). *Modern English*. Oxford University Press Walton. https://doi.org/10.2307/3585891

EnglishSentences.com. (n.d.). *Types of sentences*. Retrieved June 15, 2020, from https://englishsentences.com/types-of-sentences/

Hyams, N., & Orfitelli, R. (2014). The acquisition of Syntax. In *The Handbook of Psycholinguistics* (p. 368). Blackwell.

K12Reader. (n.d.). *The 4 types of sentences: Use them all to improve your writing*. Retrieved June 15, 2020, from https://www.k12reader.com/4-sentence-types/

Kauschke, C., Kurth, A., & Domahs, U. (2011). Acquisition of German Noun Plurals in Typically Developing Children and Children with Specific Language Impairment. *Child Development Research*, *2011*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/718925

Loeb, D. F., & Leonard, L. B. (1991). Subject case marking and verb morphology in normally developing and specifically language-impaired children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, *34*(2), 340–346. https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3402.340

Ma, W., Golinkoff, R. M., Hirsh-Pasek, K., McDonough, C., & Tardif, T. (2009). Imageability predicts the age of acquisition of verbs in chinese children. *Journal of Child Language*, *36*(2), 405–423. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000908009008

Marjanovič-Umek, L., Fekonja-Peklaj, U., & Podlesek, A. (2013). Characteristics of early vocabulary and grammar development in Slovenian-speaking infants and toddlers: A CDI-adaptation study. *Journal of Child Language*, *40*(4), 779–798. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000912000244

Moore, M. E. (2001). Third person pronoun errors by children with and without language impairment. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, *34*(3), 207–228. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9924(00)00050-2

O'Grady, W. C. (2011). Acquisition of syntax. In *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language sciences* (Issue 10, pp. 823–831). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.48-5420

Paradis, J., & Genesee, F. (1996). Syntactic acquisition in bilingual children: Autonomous or independent? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18*, 1–25.

Wexler, K. (1996). The development of inflection in a biologically based theory of language acquisition. In *Towards a Genetics of Language* (Vol. 26, Issue 4). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Appendix 1

TRANSCRIPT 1

(Recorded on Sunday, April 5, 2020 at 7:10 a.m.)

Situation: Nareswara and his brother are playing, drawing figures on the ground with a twig. His father is with them, recording with his cellphone hidden in his pocket.

N: Nareswara   B: Brother   F: Father

Turn Number	Speaker	Utterances
1	N	Iiih jangan diancurin
	B	Enggak diancurin. Tadi itu bilang Mamas giniin lagi.
2	N	haha saya injek
	B	Kan jadinya ilang (long pause)Bua apa dedek?
3	N	Buat rumah
	B	Rumah ada (ke) pala apa?
4	N	Enggak lah
	B	Ada tangan nggak?
5	N	Nggak ada lah.
	B	Ada perut nggak?
6	N	Nggak ada lah
	B	Ada pantat nggak?
7	N	Iih gila kamu ini!

		Abi!
	F	Ya Nak?
8	N	Rumah itu ga punya tangan kan?
	F	Enggak lah
9	N	Tuuuh! Nggak punya kaki juga?
	F	Nggak punya
10	N	Tuuuh! Nggak punya.
	B	Punya perut nggak?
11	N	Nggak punya lah
	B	Perut?
12	N	Nggak punya! Tu ..rumah kita nggak punya perut tuu
	B	Punya ketek nggak?
13	N	Enggak
	B	(Punya) roda nggak?
14	N	Nggak ada
	B	Punya kaca nggak?
15	N	Punya
	B	Punga tangan kaca nggak?
16	N	Nggak punya lah
	B	Punya rumah kaca nggak?
17	N	Nggak mungkin
	B	Ada heh
18	N	Nggak ada!! (marah)
	B	Iya ya ya ya
19	N	Kaca itu … kacanya disini …(menunjuk dengan ranting ke gambar di tanah)
	B	Adaaa…apa lagi ya? Ada pot nggak?
20	N	Kuat? (salah dengar)
	B	Ya

21	N	Enggak
	B	Ada ventilasi nggak?
22	N	Nggak
	B	Ha ha ha ha ha. Nggak bias napas lah kita dek Kalo nggak ada ventilasi. Itu ventilasi di atas jendela itu lo
23	N	Iya ya Uuuhhh! Abi jangan injek rumah saya! (Father is walking and stepping on the figures of the house on the ground)
	F	Oh nggak tahu tadi abi nggak lihat. Mana gambar rumahnya?
24	N	Ini!
	F	Abi juga mau gambar rumah. Abi gambar rumah di sini ya.
25	N	Abi pake golok itu ya?
	F	Iya (suara golok menggores menggambar di tanah) Ini atapnya
26	N	Ini rumah saya ni
	B	Tu dek. Kayak gitu buat rumah
27	N	Oh gitu to? Aku mau buat rumah kayak gini. Tu abi buat kaya gini juga
	F	Ini jendelanya
28	N	Jen dela. Aku nggak usah pake jendela.
	F	Ini pintunya
29	N	Iya

	F	Ini jendela lagi
30	N	Terus jendelanya banyak
	F	Iya .
31	N	Itu pintu ya?
	F	Iya, Naah
32	N	Buat rumah Ini untuk apanya Bi?
	F	Itu gentengnya
33	N	Ooh yang kita … yang kayak itu ya (menunjuk kea tap rumah)
	F	Iya
34	N	Itu nya yang kayak atas itu .. Itunya kayu… Itu kayunya
	F	Iya
35	N	Udah
	F	Kok lihat dari situ Dedekny sini
36	N	(pindah posisi) Abi ini pintunya ya?
	F	Iya. Coba dedek bikin rumah.
37	N	Rumah saya gini!
	F	Ini apanya ya?
38	N	Untuk ….. Untuk ..ininya lo biar gak kena hujan lo
	F	Oooh biar ga kena hujan. Atapnya ya?
39	N	He eh!
	F	Sekarang abi mau bikin … ini lagi
40	N	Buat apa, abi?
	F	Heh?
41	N	Buat apa?
	F	Buat… buat apa ya

42	N	Buat apa sih? Abi mau buat hewan?
	F	Iya. Hewan apa ya?
43	N	Hewan … siratop (triceratops)
	F	Heh?
44	N	Siratop
	F	Apa itu siratop
45	N	Siratop itu hewan
	B	Hewan apa Dek. Sisatop
46	N	Siratop
	B	Siapa yang ngajarin?
47	N	Mas Dimas
	B	Emang tau Dedek apa siratop itu?
48	N	Siratop itu hewan
	B	Hewan apa Dek?
49	N	Hewan lah
	F	Abi mau gambar … apa ya?
50	N	Mau gambar apa itu. Auh!
	F	Dedek dulu Dedek
51	N	Ya. Kayunya… kayunya banyak bener kayunya (long pause) Aku buat kolam ikan (drawing on the ground) Mas Ikan Dah. Aku dah buat ikan.. kolam ikan
	F	Ya
52	N	Ya. Coba bi
	F	Emm
53	N	Siratop
	F	Apa dedek mau apa
54	N	Buat siratop
	F	Siratop?

55	N	He eh
	F	Apa siratop itu? Hewan ya?
56	N	Iya. Yang warna ijo.
	F	Yang warno ijo?
57	N	He eh. Siratop
	F	Apa si ya?
58	N	Kan.. Arkan ..(panggil kakaknya) Ini bulatnya. Kan Arkan ini badannya kan? Bulatnya matanya ini. Lagi lah
	B	Udaah
59	N	Sampe sini Kan ekornya. Arkan sampe sini ekornya … tuh … Sini ekornya Kan … tuuh gitu.
	B	Ni kakinya
	F	Uubaba
60	N	Ubabah? Apa itu ubabah? O baba o baba
	B	Aku buat kakinya
61	N	Kakiku Eito! Eh salah pula.
	B	Uuu mai no eitu!
62	N	(teriak) waaaatipaaaa (suara tanpa arti) atoba ti …. Bineko…. Liat dianya takut. (very long pause) Ah! Dimana tadi (menggeledah kakaknya mencari mainannya)
	B	Aaapa lo? (suara tinggi protes)
63	N	(teriak) iyaa Jiiiwaku ini (dengan nada)

		Huicong! Yaaat sama pedang! Hiyuut hoo…hiyuuuut hoooo

Appendix 2

TRANSCRIPT 1 ANALYSIS
SENTENCE TYPES, STRUCTURES AND ELEMENTS
(Recorded on Sunday, April 5, 2020 at 7:10 a.m.)

NO	UTTERANCES	TYPE	SENTENCE STRUCTURE
1	Iiih!	E	Interj.
2	Iih **gila kamu ini!**	E	C + S
3	Tuuuh!	E	Dem.
4	Nggak punya!	E	Neg. + V
5	**Nggak ada!!** (marah)	E	Interj.
6	Auh!	E	Interj.
7	Kan.. Arkan ..(panggil, marah)	E	S
8	Kan Arkan **ini badannya**, Kan!	E	S + C
9	Sini ekornya Kan …	E	C + S
10	Tuuh gitu.	E	Dem. + C
11	(teriak) hyaaaatipaaaa	E	Interj.
12	Liat dianya takut.	E	V + S + C
13	Ah!	E	Interj.
14	(teriak) iyaa	E	Interj.
15	Yaaat sama pedang!	E	Interj. + C
16	Tuuuh! Nggak punya.	E	Dem. + Neg. + V

17	Abi!	I	S
18	Ya. Coba Bi	I	V + S
19	Jangan diancurin	I -	Neg. + V
20	Uuuhhh! Abi jangan injek rumah saya!	I -	S + neg. + V + O
21	abi buat kaya gini juga	I +	S + V + C + Adv
22	O baba o baba	N	-
23	Eito!	N	-
24	(suara tanpa arti) atoba ti …. Bineko….	N	-
25	Huicong!	N	-
26	Hiyuut hoo…hiyuuuut hoooo!	N	-
27	Rumah itu ga punya tangan kan?	Q	S + Neg + V + O + Part.
28	Nggak punya kaki juga?	Q	Neg. + V + O
29	Ubabah?	Q	S
30	Apa itu ubabah?	Q	Wh- + S
31	Dimana tadi?	Q	Wh + adv.
32	Kuat? (salah dengar)	Q -	C
33	Abi pake golok itu ya?	Q +	S + V + O + Part.
34	Itu pintu ya?	Q +	S + C
35	Ini untuk apanya Bi?	Q +	S + C (prep +Wh-)
36	Ooh yang kita … yang kayak itu ya?	Q +	O (pron. + comp.)
37	(pindah posisi) Abi ini pintunya ya?	Q +	S + C + Part.
38	Buat apa, abi?	Q +	V + Wh- + S
39	Buat apa?	Q +	V + Wh-
40	Buat apa sih?	Q +	V + Wh- + Emph. Part.
41	Abi mau buat hewan?	Q +	S + V + O
42	Mau gambar apa itu?	Q +	V + Wh-
43	Enggak lah	S -	Neg. + Emph. Part.

44	Nggak ada lah.	S -	Neg. + V + emph. Part.
45	Nggak ada lah	S -	Neg. + V + emph. Part.
46	Nggak punya lah	S -	Neg. + V + emph. Part.
47	Nggak ada	S -	Neg. + V
48	Nggak punya lah	S -	Neg. + V + emph. Part.
49	Nggak mungkin	S -	Neg. + modal
50	Enggak	S -	Neg
51	Nggak	S -	Neg
52	Aku nggak usah pake jendela.	S -	S + Neg. + V + O
53	Tu ..rumah kita nggak punya perut tuu	S -	S + Neg. + V + O
54	Enggak	S -	Neg.
55	Buat rumah	S +	V + O
56	Iya ya	S +	Affirm.
57	Jen dela.	S +	C
58	haha saya injek	S +	S + V
59	Punya	S +	V
60	Kaca itu … kacanya disini ….	S +	S + C
61	Ini!	S +	S
62	Ini rumah saya ni	S +	S + C
63	Oh gitu to?	S +	C + part.
64	Aku mau buat rumah kayak gini.	S +	S + V + O + C
65	Iya	S +	Affirm.
66	Terus jendelanya banyak	S +	S + C
67	Buat rumah	S +	V + O
68	Itu nya yang kayak atas itu ..	S +	S + C
69	Itunya kayu…	S +	S + C
70	Itu kayunya	S +	S + C
71	Udah	S +	Adv.

72	Rumah saya gini!	S +	S + C
73	He eh!	S +	Affirm.
74	Hewan … siratop (triceratops)	S +	S + C
75	Siratop	S +	S
76	Siratop itu hewan	S +	S + C
77	Siratop	S +	S
78	Mas Dimas	S +	S
79	Siratop itu hewan	S +	S + C
80	Hewan lah	S +	S + Emph. Part.
81	Ya.	S +	Affirm.
82	Kayunya… kayunya banyak bener kayunya	S +	S + C
83	Aku buat kolam ikan	S +	S + V + O
84	Mas Ikan	S +	S
85	Dah.	S +	Adv.
86	Aku dah buat ikan.. kolam ikan	S +	S + V + O
87	Siratop	S +	S
88	Buat siratop	S +	V + O
89	He eh	S +	Affrim.
90	Iya, yang warna ijo.	S +	Affirm., + C (Pron. + C)
91	He eh. Siratop	S +	Affirm. + S
92	Ini bulatnya.	S +	S + C
93	Bulatnya matanya ini.	S +	C + S
94	Lagi lah	S +	Adv.
95	Sampe sini Kan ekornya.	S +	C + S
96	Arkan, sampe sini ekornya … tuh …	S +	C + S
97	Kakiku	S +	S
98	Eh salah pula.	S +	C
99	Jiiiwaku ini (dengan nada)	S +	S

100	Untuk …..Untuk ..ininya lo biar gak kena hujan lo	S +, -	C + Adverbial Clause