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ABSTRACT


KEY WORDS: Language Acquisition, Utterance, Telegraphic Speech.

Children are human beings that often become the subjects in many kinds of researches. The writer conducted her research based on the questions “What are the elements of 2 -3 year old Indonesian children’s utterances and Are there any specific differences in children’s telegraphic speech? The writer was inspired by a study conducted by Angela in 1997 and a study by Halliday, Miyahara and Brown as quoted by Wijaya (1997: 27). They observed children at the age of 1.8 – 2.2 years old and they made telegraphic speech. They omitted the grammatical morphemes, subject, bound morphemes, and preposition.

This study was a descriptive and qualitative one in nature. It described the observed phenomena in the form of utterances. The writer attempted to identify, analyze and describe the children’s telegraphic speech. In order to obtain the data, the writer applied a non-participant observation in which the writer stood apart from the subjects’ conversation she was investigating. The subjects of this study were six Indonesian children at the age of 2-3 years old. The subjects consisted of 4 male and 2 female children from middle class society.

The key instruments of the study were the writer and the caretakers. They were equipped with tape recorder, several cassettes, and note book. The data of the study were the subjects’ recorded conversations with their member of the family. They were in form of spoken discourse. The recordings were then transcribed into written discourse and analyzed based on the theory of telegraphic speech. After recording, noting and analyzing the subjects’ conversations with their family and caretakers, the writer prepared parameter for the data analysis. It was signed by omissions of some functional words (articles and prepositions), object omission, subject omission and other omissions.

After analyzing the data, the writer found that all the subjects had produced one-word, two-word, three-word and more than three-word utterances. Other than that, each subjects had lack of elements like those in adult’s speech. The first subject was Ela and she had lack of the subject, object, predicate, suffix, adjective, subject-object, and subject-predicate of her sentences. The second one, Erdin, had lack of the subject, object, adverb, subject-predicate, and subject-suffix in his utterances. Subject three is Farel did not mention the subject and subject-predicate-preposition in his sentences. Nico, subject four, had no lack of elements in his conversations. The fourth subject was Daniel. He had lack of one element, which was the subject of his sentences. The last subject, Sarah, had lack of subject and subject-predicate in her speech.
Based on the analysis, the writer could conclude that Ela was the subject who had the most lack of elements in her sentences. Erdin was the second subject who had many lack of elements. Both Sarah and Farel made two different lack of elements. Daniel only had one lack of element and Nico was the one who did not have any lack of elements in his conversations.