Communicative Acts Performance of an Indonesian Child

M.G. Retno Palupi
English Department, Faculty of Teachers Training and Education,
Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, Surabaya, Indonesia
e-mail: mgretno_palupi@yahoo.co.id, retno@mail.wima.ac.id

***Abstract**: This study attempts to describe the communicative acts of an Indonesian child by using the coding system of speech acts proposed by Ninio and Snow. The data are the subject's spoken utterances which were recorded. The findings show that the subject performed (in frequency of occurrence order) Questions and Responses (33.96%), Directives and Responses (25.15%), Statements and Responses (19.49%), Markings and Responses (7.54%0), Evaluations (5.66%), Commitments and Responses (5.66%), Declarations and Responses (1.25%), and Speech Elicitations and Responses (1.25%). The Performances and Demands for Clarifications were not performed by the subject at all.*

***Key words**: communicative acts, child*

Development of oral language is one of the child's most natural and impressive accomplishments. All children learn their language at an early age through use and without formal instruction. It implies that one source for learning must be innate. According to Chomsky a child possesses a set of innate principles which guide language processing (Ellis, 1986, p. 14). This enables children to work through linguistic rules on their own. As human beings have an innate gift, they are capable of figuring out the rules of the language used in their environment. However, children are born not just to speak but also to interact socially. Even before they are able to use words, they use cries and gestures to convey meaning. In addition, they often understand the meaning that others convey. The point of learning language and interacting socially, then, is not to master rules but to make connections with other people and to make sense of experiences.

Oral language, the complex system that relates sounds to meaning, is made up of three components: the phonological, semantic, and syntactic. Speakers of a language constantly use these three components of language

together, usually in social situations. However, the use of these three components in social situation will be complete with the existence of the fourth component, i.e. pragmatics which deals with rules of language use. Pragmatics rules are part of our communicative competence, our ability to speak appropriately in different situations. For example, in a conversational way at home and in a more formal way at a job interview. Young children need to learn the different ways of speaking to their parents at home and to their teachers at school where, for example, teachers often ask rhetorical questions. Learning pragmatic rules is as important as learning the rules of the other three components of language, since people are perceived and judged based on both what they say and when to say it.

A child may pronounce words clearly, have a large vocabulary, use long and complex sentences, but still have a communication problem if he or she has not mastered the rules for appropriate social language or pragmatics. The pragmatic skills in children manifest in various ways. It can be saying appropriate or related things during conversations, following the rules of taking turns, making requests, asking for permission, answering calls, or expressing sympathy. A child needs to know how to exhibit attentiveness to hearer, or ask question politely. Therefore, acquiring pragmatic skills is absolutely necessary. According to Ninio and Snow (1996), pragmatic skills cover, among others, the communicative acts or speech acts to use Searle's term (1969). Knowing how important it is for a child to master the rules of language use as early as possible and seeing the scarcity of studies focused on children's communicative acts performance, this study is then an attempt to describe the communicative acts performance of an Indonesian child.

Communicative Acts

In light of theoretical work by philosophers such as Austin and Searle, interpersonal use of speech involves types of knowledge go beyond the rules of syntax and semantics (Ninio, & Snow, 1996, p. 15). Speech is used to perform social acts such as to greet, to request, or to draw another's attention to something. A major developmental task in the domain of pragmatics is learning to use speech for the performance of such communicative acts. These acts consist of the intentional and overt communication of some content to another person. Ninio and Snow propose a coding system that distinguishes sixty-three codes of speech acts

for individual utterances in interchanges. These sixty-three codes are the ones the writer refers to in revealing the subject's communicative acts performance.

Speech Acts Codes, Categories, and Definitions, by Major Pragmatic Force (Ninio A., & Snow, C.E., 1996)

Directives and Responses

RP Request/propose/suggest action for hearer; proposed action might also involve speaker
RQ Yes/no question about hearer's wishes and intentions that functions as a suggestion
DR Dare=challenge hearer to perform action
WD Call attention to hearer by name or by substitute exclamations
SS Signal to start performing an act, e.g. to run or roll a ball; pace performance of acts by hearer
AD Agree to do=agree to carry out requested or proposed by other
AL Agree to do for the last time
RD Refuse to do=refuse to carry out act requested or proposed by other; including refusals by giving excuses and reasons for noncompliance
CS Counter suggestion; an indirect refusal
GI Give in; accept other's insistence or refusal
Ac Answer calls; show attentiveness to communications
GR Give reason; justify a request for action, refusal, prohibition, and so on

Speech Elicitations and Responses

EI Elicit imitation of word or sentence by explicit command
MU Model utterance for imitation without explicit request
EC Elicit utterance of word or sentence
EX Elicit completion of rote-learned text
EA Elicit mimicking of noises made by animals, and so on
RT Repeat/imitate other's utterance
SC Complete statement or other utterance in compliance with request eliciting completion
CX Complete text if so demanded

Commitments and Responses
SI State intent to carry out act by speaker
FP Ask for permission to carry out act by speaker
PD Promise
TD Threaten to do
PA Permit hearer to perform act
PF Prohibit/forbid hearer to perform act

Declarations and Responses
DC Declare=create a new state of affairs by declaration
YD Agree to a declaration
ND Object to a declaration

Markings and Responses
MK Mark occurrence of events (i.e., thank, greet, apologize, congratulate, etc.)
TO Mark transfer of object to hearer
CM Commiserate, express sympathy for hearer's distress
EM Exclaim in distress, pain
EN Endearment=express positive emotion
ES Exclaim in surprise=express surprise
XA Exhibit attentiveness to hearer
PT Polite response to thanking

Statements and Responses
ST State=make a declarative statement
AP Agree with proposition expressed by previous speaker
DW Disagree with proposition expressed by previous speaker
WS Express a wish
CN Count

Questions and Responses
QN Wh-question=ask a product question
YQ Yes/no question=ask a yes/no question
TQ Restricted alternative
SA Answer a wh-question with a statement
AA Answer in affirmative to a yes/no question
QA Answer in negative to a yes/no question

YA Answer a question with a yes/no question
NA Nonsatisfying answer to question
RA Refuse to answer

Performances
PR Perform verbal move in game

Evaluations
PM Praise for motor acts, that is, nonverbal behavior
ET Exclaim in enthusiasm=express enthusiasm for hearer's performance
CR Criticize=point out error in nonverbal act
AB Approve of appropriate behavior; express positive evaluation of hearer's or speaker's acts; approve of hearer's or speaker's acts
DS Disapprove, scold, protest disruptive behavior; express negative evaluation of hearer's or speaker's behavior as inappropriate
ED Exclaim in disapproval

Demands for Clarification
RR Rerun request=request to repeat utterance

METHODOLOGY

This study is descriptive and qualitative in nature. It describes the observed phenomena in the form of utterances. Basically, this is a case study. It is an in depth investigation of a unit in its real context. One major data gathering technique of this case study was observation (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000, p. 186). The two principle kinds of observation in case study–participant observation and non-participant observation–were applied. Both the participant and non-participant were done in order to get sufficient and representative data from the subject. In participant observation, deliberate elicitation was sometimes done to obtain the intended responses from the subject. However the elicitation was done in a subtle way, i.e. without making the subject aware that he was being elicited. The data gathered were then identified and qualitatively described and analyzed based on the theories of communicative acts.

The subject of the study was a male child, Ignatius Refian Mahendra. He was born physically and mentally normal in October 21st, 1999 in

Surakarta. He was three years and four months old when his utterances started being recorded. The recording lasted for 6 months.

The data of the study were the subject's conversations with his parents, caretaker, aunts, and classmates in school which were recorded at two different places, i.e. at home or any place where the subject was with his parents, aunt, or caretaker, and in school when the subject was with his classmates. The observation which took place at home was done everyday without any time limitation. The observation which took place in school was done three times a week (every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday). It was done for more or less thirty minutes during the playtime and mealtime.

The recorded data were first transcribed. Based upon the transcriptions, the conversations were then analyzed on the basis of communicative acts theory. To ensure reliability, a triangulation was done which involved a trained rater who coded the same data. Then the results or findings of the analysis were identified and described to ascertain the communicative acts acquired by the subject.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the data analysis of the ten speech act codes which are reflected in different categories are as follows:

Table 1. Directives and Responses

No	Communicative Acts Codes	Frequency of Occurrence	Proportion (in %)
1	RP	16	40
2	RD	9	22.5
3	SS	4	10
4	AD	4	10
5	GR	3	7.5
6	RQ	1	2.5
7	DR	1	2.5
8	CL	1	2.5
9	AC	1	2.5
10	WD	0	0
11	AL	0	0
12	CS	0	0
13	GI	0	0
	TOTAL	40	100

The table above shows that RP, i.e. request/propose/suggest action for hearer, has the highest frequency of occurrence. The followings are some examples:

1. Buatin susu. *(Make a bottle of milk for me.)*
2. Ambilin gitarnya, Ma. *(Take the guitar for me, Mom.)*
3. Ayah jalan, lari. Lagi Yah lagi. *(Dad, walk, run. Do it again, Dad, again.)*
4. Adek, gendong. *(Carry me.)*

The subject performed RD, i.e. refuse to do=refuse to carry out act requested or proposed by others, 9 times. The utterances that reflected this code are:

1. Mother: Nggak boleh … nanti Adek batuk-batuk. (*No… you may cough)*
   Ignas : Biar, Adek mau sama kelinci di sini. *(I want to be with the rabbit)*
2. Father : Iya Dek… ayo bobok. *(O.k. Dek, it's bedtime)*
   Ignas : Adek mau lihat film. *(I want to watch the film.)*
3. Caretaker: Dek, nih Yangti telpon. *(Dek, grandma wants you on the phone.)*
   Ignas : Adek baru main. *(I am still playing.)*

Other communicative act codes from this category performed by the subject were SS (signal to start performing an act), AD (agree to do=agree to carry out act requested by other), GR (give reason; justify a request for action, prohibition, etc), RQ (yes/no question about hearer's wishes and intentions that function as suggestion), DR (dare=challenge hearer to perform action), CL (call attention to hearer by name or by substitute exclamations), and AC (answer calls, show attentiveness to communication).

Table 2. Speech Elicitations and Responses

No	Communicative Acts Codes	Frequency of Occurrence	Proportion (in %)
1	EC	1	50
2	RT	1	50
3	EI	0	0
4	EX	0	0
5	EA	0	0
6	MU	0	0
7	SC	0	0
8	CX	0	0
	TOTAL	2	100

In this Speech Elicitations and Responses category, the codes which were performed by the subject were only two. They were EC (elicit completion of word or sentence) and RT (repeat/imitate other's utterance). Each code occurred once. The following is the utterance in which EC was found:

The subject performed RT in the utterance below:

1. Aunty : Bilang yang baik dong, pakai tante manis.
   (Say it nicely, please, using sweet aunty.)
   Ignas : Tante manis … *(Sweet aunty …)*

Other codes, EI (elicit imitation of word or sentence by explicit command), MU (model utterance for imitation without explicit request), EX (elicit completion of rote-learned text), EA (elicit mimicking of noises made by animals, etc.), SC (complete statement or other utterance), and CX (complete text) were not performed at all by the subject.

Table 3. Commitments and Responses

No	Communicative Acts Codes	Frequency of Occurrence	Proportion (in %)
1	PF	3	33.3
2	FP	2	22.2
3	PD	2	22.2
4	PA	2	22.2
5	SI	0	0
6	TD	0	0
	TOTAL	9	100

The table shows that the subject performed PF (prohibit/probed hearer to perform act) the most, i.e. three times. The PF code was performed in these utterances:

1. Mother : Mama bobok dulu ya. *(Let me sleep ahead.)*
   Ignas : *Don't sleep Ma. Don't.* (*Don't sleep, Mom. Don't*)
2. Mother : Dek nih matanya Mama tinggal 2 watt. *(Dek, I can't keep my eyes open.)*
   Ignas : Nggak bobok, nggak bobok. *(Don't sleep, don't sleep.)*

Other communicative acts codes performed by the subject are FP (ask permission to carry out act by speaker), PD (promise), and PA (permit

hearer to perform act). The followings are the utterances in which FP code was found:

1. Tante, Adek boleh minta ini. *(Aunty, may I have this?)*
2. Tante manis, Adek boleh pinjam. *(Sweet aunty, may I borrow this?)*

The subject performed PD in the utterances below:

1. Aunty : Ya, tapi Adek janji bukanya pelan-pelan. Janji?
   (Yes, but please promise that you will open it slowly. Promise?)
   Ignas : Ya. *(Yes.)*
2. *I won't do it again.*

There two codes which were not performed by the subject, i.e. SI and TD.

Table 4. Declarations and Responses

No	Communicative Acts Codes	Frequency of Occurrence	Proportion (in %)
1	DP	2	100
2	DC	0	0
3	YD	0	0
4	ND	0	0
	TOTAL	2	100

The results of the data analysis presented in the above table shows that in this category there is only one code performed by the subject, i.e. DP (declare (fantasy)=create make believe reality by declaration). This code performed twice in these following utterances:

1. *Mbah mbah* robotnya terbang, *megazone*, hhhmm aku robot *megazone*.
   (Mbah, Mbah the robot is flying, megazone, hhmm I am the megazone robot)
   'mbah' in this article refers to Ignas' caretaker which means grandma.
2. Aku robot *megazone, doeng* (*the sound of collision*). Awas *mbah*.
   (I am the megazone robot, doeeng. Watch out Mbah.)

The other three codes, i.e. DC (declare=create a new state of affairs by declaration), YD (agree to a declaration), and ND (object to a declaration) were not performed by the subject.

Table 5. Markings and Responses

No	Communicative Acts Codes	Frequency of Occurrence	Proportion (in %)
1	CM	4	33.3
2	MK	3	25
3	XA	3	25
4	EM	1	8.3
5	PT	1	8.3
6	TO	0	0
7	EN	0	0
8	ES	0	0
	TOTAL	12	100

The results of the data analysis presented in the above table shows that CM (commiserate, express sympathy for hearer's distress) has the highest frequency of occurrence. It was performed four times in the followings utterances:

1. Ndak *pa-pa* Ma nanti *lak* sembuh sendiri. *(It's ok Mom. It'll heal soon.)*
2. Nanti sembuh Ma. Mama ndak nangis. *(It'll heal, Mom. Don't cry Mom.)*
3. Nggak *pa-pa* Ma, entar juga sembuh. *(It's ok Mom. Soon it'll heal.)*
4. Nanti sembuh Ma. *(It will heal, Mom.)*

Both MK (mark occurrence of event (i.e. thank, greet, apologize, etc.)) and XA (exhibit attentiveness to hearer) were performed by the subject three times. The utterances in which MK was performed are:

1. Terima kasih. *(Thank you.)*
2. Makasih. *(Thanks.)*
3. *I'm sorry Ma. (I'm sorry, Mom.)*

The followings are the utterances in which the subject performed XA code:

1. Mother : Terus jatuh *aaaaaaggghhh…*
   (Then it falls aaaaaaggghhh…)
   Ignas : Iya *hiiiiii* … sakit. *(Hiiii…it must be painful.)*
2. Mother : Iya. Terus *buuk* jatuh di tanah.
   (Yes. Then bum, it falls on the ground.)
   Ignas : Aduh, kura-kuranya gitu ya Ma. Kakinya di atas.
   (Ouch! The turtle falls like that, Mom, doesn't it? Its legs are in the air.)

Other codes that were performed by the subject are EM (exclaim in distress or pain) and PT (polite response to thanking). Each of them was performed by the subject once. TO (mark transfer of object to hearer), EN (endearment=express positive emotion), and ES (exclaim in surprise) were not performed by the subject.

Table 6. Statements and Responses

No	Communicative Acts Codes	Frequency of Occurrence	Proportion (in %)
1	DW	14	45.1
2	ST	12	38.7
3	AP	5	16.1
4	WS	0	0
5	CN	0	0
	TOTAL	31	100

This category has only five different codes; however, the occurrences of the two of them were high. DW (disagree with proposition expressed by previous speaker) occurred the most. The subject performed this in various contexts. The followings are the utterances in which the code was performed:

1. Friend : Sandalmu emas. *(Your sandals are gold.)*
   Ignas : Itu *yellow* itu. *(They're yellow.)*
2. Friend : Ndak enak. *(It is not tasty.)*
   Ignas : Enak kata Mama. *(Mom says it's tasty.)*
3. Father : Tangan Dek. *(Dek, hands.)*
   Ignas : Kaki. *(Feet.)*
4. Friend : Aku mau pulang. *(I want to go home.)*
   Ignas : Hujan kok pulang. (*It's raining. Why going home?)*

ST (make a declarative statement) was performed twelve times and AP (agree with proposition expressed by previous speaker) was performed by the subject five times. The followings are some of them:

1. Mother : Wah, Adek hebat ya. *(Wow, Adek is great.)*
   Ignas : Gini Ma. *(showing his thumb up) (Like this, Mom.)*
2. Mother : … di lantai ya. *(…on the floor.)*
   Ignas : Ya. *(Ok.)*
3. Friend : Bolanya aku dulu. *(I kick the ball first.)*
   Ignas : Ya. *(Ok.)*

There are two codes in this category which were not performed by the subject. They are WS (express a wish) and CN (count).

Table 7. Questions and Responses

No	Communicative Acts Codes	Frequency of Occurrence	Proportion (in %)
1	QN	19	35.1
2	SA	15	27.7
3	AA	10	18.5
4	YQ	5	9.2
5	TQ	2	3.7
6	AN	2	3.7
7	QA	1	1.8
8	YA	0	0
9	NA	0	0
10	RA	0	0
	TOTAL	54	100

The table shows that QN code (wh-question=ask a product question) has the highest frequency. It occurred nineteen times. The second place goes to SA code (answer a wh-question with statement) which occurred 15 times. The followings are some examples of the subject's utterances in which code QN was found:

1. Kok lewat sini Yah? *(Why do we go this way, Dad?)*
2. Kamu apa? *(Who are you in this game?)*
3. Yah, kok diputusi? *(Dad, why are you cutting it?)*
4. Emas itu apa? *(What is gold?)*
5. Yah, kok panjang Yah. Kok panjang? *(Dad, why is it long? Why?)*
6. Kenapa? Kok kamu nangis? *(Why are you crying?)*

The followings are some examples of SA code performed by the subject:

1. Caretaker : Botolnya di mana? Tadi Adek yang *simpen to*?
   (Where is the bottle? You kept it, didn't you?)
   Ignas : Di kamar. *(In the bedroom.)*
2. Mother : Tadi Adek belajar apa? *(What did you learn at school?)*
   Ignas : Adek lihat film. *(I watched a movie.)*
3. Mother : … terus? *(…then?)*
   Ignas : *Buuk* lagi gini … kayak monyet … nungging.
   (Buuk like this…like a monkey with his bottom up.)

AA (answer in the affirmative to yes/no question) occurred ten times. The followings utterances are some of them:

1. Caretaker : …yang dingin? Iya? *(You want it cold? Don't you?)*
   Ignas : Dingin, Adek ndak mau *anget. (Yes, I don't want it warm.)*
2. Mother : Tadi Adek main di tempatnya dik Nia ya?
   (You played at Nia's house, didn't you?)
   Ignas : Ya. *(Yes.)*
3. Mother : Mainnya dipangku? *(Did you put it on your lap?)*
   Ignas : Iya. *(Yes.)*

Other codes performed by the subject are YQ code (yes/no question=ask a yes/no question), TQ (restricted alternative), AN (answer in negative to yes/no question), AN (answer in negative to yes/no question), and QA (answer a question with question). In this category the subject did not perform YA code (answer a question with a yes/no question), NA (nonsatisfying answer to question), and RA (refuse to answer).

Table 8. Performances

No	Communicative Acts Codes	Frequency of Occurrence	Proportion (in %)
1	PR	0	0
	TOTAL	0	0

This category has only one code, i.e. PR (perform verbal move in a game) and the subject did not perform it at all.

Table 9. Evaluations

No	Communicative Acts Codes	Frequency of Occurrence	Proportion (in %)
1	DS	4	44.4
2	ED	3	33.3
3	CR	1	11.1
4	AB	1	11.1
5	PM	0	0
6	ET	0	0
	TOTAL	9	100

The table above shows that in this category DS code (disapprove, scold, protest disruptive behavior, express negative evaluation of the hearer's behavior as inappropriate) has the highest frequency of occurrence. The subject performed this code four times. ED code (exclaim in disapproval) was performed by the subject three times. CR (criticize=point out error in nonverbal act) and AB (approve of appropriate behavior; approve/express positive evaluation of hearer's acts) were performed by the subject once. The other two codes in this category, i.e. PM (praise for motor acts) and ET (exclaim in enthusiasm=express enthusiasm for hearer's performance) were not performed by the subject. The followings are the utterances in which the subject performed DS code:

1. Mbah jangan gitu mainnya, robotnya jatuh. Adek tendang tadi. Bukan yang itu, yang blue, yang blue.
   (Mbah, don't play like that. The robot falls down. I kicked it. Not that one, the blue one.)
2. Jatuhnya di karpet, nggak di lantai. *(It falls on the carpet, not on the floor.)*
3. Pukul-pukul, Adek nggak suka. *(Hit… hit. I don't like it.)*
4. Bilangi kok. *(I told you.)*

The subject performed ED three times.
1. Mau! *(I want it!)*
2. Bisa! *(I can!)*
3. Kamu nakal! *(You are naughty!)*

The AB was performed once in the following utterance:
1. Di lantai mbah, gitu ya gitu. *(On the floor, Mbah. Yes, like that.)*

The gesture below indicated the subject's performance on CR code.
1. Ignas: *(shaking his head).*

Table 10. Demands for Clarification

No	Communicative Acts Codes	Frequency of Occurrence	Proportion (in %)
1	RR	0	0
	TOTAL	0	0

This category has only one code, i.e. RR (rerun request=request to repeat utterance) and the subject did not perform it at all.

From all the tables presented above, the communicative acts performed by the subject are summarized as follows:

Table 11. Communicative Acts Performance

No	Communicative Acts Category	Frequency of Occurrence	Proportion (in %)
1	Questions and Responses	54	33.96
2	Directives and Responses	40	25.15
3	Statements and Responses	31	19.49
4	Markings and Responses	12	7.54
5	Evaluations	9	5.66
6	Commitments and Responses	9	5.66
7	Speech Elicitations and Responses	2	1.25
8	Declarations and Responses	2	1.25
9	Performances	0	0
10	Demands for Clarifications	0	0
	TOTAL	159	100

The findings show that the total number of communicative acts performed by the subject is 159 times. Questions and Responses account for 33.96% of the total number of communicative acts performance. Among the codes in this category, QN code (wh-question-ask a product question) has the highest frequency of occurrence. This fact shows that at the age of three the subject has a great curiosity in which he seeks answers for all his questions concerning with his world. SA code (answer a wh-question with a statement) comes after the QN code. This indicates that asking and answering questions are the most frequent activities done by the subject. This is well supported by the fact that the subject did not perform the RA code (refuse to answer) at all. The NA code did not occur either. This means that the subject has good comprehension of all the questions addressed to him as he answered all the questions and never gave unsatisfying answers. The subject's competence in answering questions was reflected in his ability to provide different answers appropriately to different kind of questions. He was capable of answering in affirmative to yes/no questions (AA), answering in negative to yes/no questions (AN), answering a wh-question with statement (SA), and answering a question with a wh-question (QA).

25.15 % of the total number of communicative acts performed by the subject is Directives and Responses category which has thirteen different codes. There is a significant difference in the occurrence of the codes in this category. Total occurrence of the codes in this category is forty times and sixteen of it is the total occurrence of RP code (request/propose/suggest action for hearer). Then followed by RD (refuse to do = refuse to carry out act requested or proposed by other) which occurred nine times. This is an interesting fact as the subject showed fondness for requesting/ proposing/suggesting actions to others, on the contrary he showed the tendency to refuse to carry out act requested/proposed by others. However, this tendency is somehow reduced by the performance of AD (agree to do=agree to carry out requested or proposed by other) which occurred four times. In requesting/ proposing/suggesting action, the subject often signaled the hearer to start performing it by using the words '*ayo'* (come on) and '*cepet' (hurry up).*

On the other hand the subject did not merely make requests, refuse to do requested acts, and prohibit others to do particular actions as he provided reasons to justify his request for action, refusal, and prohibition. Challenged hearer to perform action, called attention to hearer by name, answered call, and asked yes/no question that functioned as suggestion were performed by the subject once.

In Statements and Responses category the subject often exhibited disagreement with the propositions expressed by the previous speakers. It frequently happened that the subject had different or opposite idea/ opinion/intention about particular things. The frequency of occurrence of this code is the highest, 45.16%. Comparing with AP code (agree with proposition expressed by the previous speaker) there is a significant different in which AP occurrence is only 16.1%. This fact indicates that the subject had the tendency to debate or argues others' idea/intention/opinion. The subject also actively made declarative statements which were various according to the different situation he was in.

The subject's performance on Markings and Responses covered 7.54% of the total number of performed communicative acts codes. There are eight codes in this category and the subject performed five codes only. From this five codes the subject performed CM (commiserate, express sympathy for hearer's distress) four times. This code was deliberately elicited by the writer by pretending to be in distress of a wound. Without knowing that he was being elicited, the subject sincerely expressed his

sympathy by saying *"Nggak pa-pa Ma. Nanti juga sembuh." (It's ok mom. It will heal soon.)*

Besides saying that heart warming sentence calmly, the subject also showed a caring attention. To be honest the writer was somehow touched. In his interaction with others the subject exhibited good manners as he thanked others when he received something from them and, on the contrary, was able to give response to thanking politely. In building communication with others the subject was able to play his part as a listener well. The subject was also able to exclaim in pain, but he never exclaimed in surprise. The writer had attempted to elicit this code; however, it resulted in vain.

In Commitments and Responses category the subject often prohibited or forbade hearer to perform an act. He did this three times. On the contrary, the subject also performed the opposite, i.e. permit hearer to perform act twice. Therefore, it can be said that the performance of these two codes are somehow balanced. None surpasses the other. Before carrying out an act, the subject showed good manners as he asked for permission beforehand. At the age of three the subject was also able to make a promise.

In interacting with others the subject quite frequently disapproved, scolded, protested disruptive behavior then expressed negative evaluation on it as inappropriate. In the Evaluations category this code occurred four times, the most frequently. Then followed by ED code or exclaim in disapproval, three times. It shows that these two codes relate to one another. As the subject disapproved/protested particular behavior, he expressed his disapproval/protest in exclamation. The subject performance on CR (criticize=point out error in nonverbal act) and AB (approve appropriate behavior) was low as each occurred once.

The subject's performance on Speech Elicitations and Responses and Declarations and Responses was also low. In Speech Elicitations and Responses only two codes out of 8 were performed by the subject. Moreover each of those two codes was performed only once. The codes were EC (elicit completion of word/sentence) and RT (repeat/imitate other's utterance). The subject performed EC when he expected his mother to complete his English sentence by mentioning its first word. Declarations and Responses category has 4 codes and the subject performed only one of them, i.e. when he was creating a make-believe reality or declaring fantasy.

CONCLUSION

From the discussion above we know that the subject did not perform two categories. They are Performances which has 1 code, i.e. PR (perform verbal move in a game) and Demands for Clarifications which also has one code, i.e. RR (rerun request=request to repeat utterance). There is no underlying reason for this except due to the subject age in which a child of the age of three still needs more time and stimulus from his/her environment to develop his pragmatic skills. According to Ninio and Snow, children's ability to relate one's own utterance to the preceding utterance of the interlocutor and in a content-based way, provide answers, acknowledge requests, or request clarification of the interlocutor's utterance emerge later on (1996, p. 143). In Ignas' case this late-emerging abilities result in the absence of some communicative acts codes.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, M. (1982). *Explanations in the study of child language development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Caroll, D.W. (1986). *Psychology of language*. California: Wadsworthc.

Cohen, E., Marion, L. & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.

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

Dunchan, J. F., Hewitt, L.E., & Sonnemeier. (1994). *Pragmatics from theory to practice*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Ellis, R. (1986). *Understanding second language acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Levinson, S.D. (1983). *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McCharty, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ninio, A. & Snow, C.E. (1996). *Pragmatic development*. Colorado: Westview Press.

Schegloff, E., & Sacks, H. (1974). *A simplest systematic for the organization of turn taking for conversation*. New York: Academic Press.