

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter presents the conclusions derived from the findings and discussions outlined in the preceding chapters and proposes a number of suggestions informed by the results of the study. The conclusions are formulated through a synthesis of the analysis of orthographic representations and variations observed in the Amanatun language, with particular attention to how these patterns reflect different approaches to encoding phonological and morphological structures. In addition, the chapter considers the broader implications of these orthographic practices for language learning and literacy development. The suggestions offered in this chapter are intended to contribute to the future development of Amanatun orthography, to inform educational and community-based practices, and to identify directions for further research that may support the documentation, teaching, and maintenance of the Amanatun language.

5.1. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the Amanatun orthographies employed in UBB and LAI publications reflect distinct approaches to representing the phonological and morphological structure of the language. The differences observed in the representation of clitics, long vowels, possessive forms, and negation indicate the coexistence of divergent orthographic principles, suggesting that Amanatun orthography remains in a developmental stage and has not yet reached a fully standardized normative system.

With regard to Clitics, the findings reveal that UBB consistently represents clitic forms in accordance with their grammatical function and

phonological realization in spoken Amanatun. This practice allows clitics to be clearly identified as grammatical elements and supports the recognition of syntactic relations in written texts. In contrast, LAI exhibits variation in the representation of clitics, including differences in attachment and occasional omission. Such variation reduces the visibility of grammatical relationships and may obscure the distinction between clitic elements and lexical bases, particularly for learners who rely on written input to infer grammatical structure.

In the representation of Long Vowels, a clear divergence between the two orthographies is evident. UBB consistently marks vowel length through vowel doubling, thereby preserving phonological contrasts that are meaningful in the spoken language. This explicit representation strengthens the correspondence between orthography and pronunciation and contributes to phonological transparency. Conversely, LAI does not distinguish between long and short vowels in writing, resulting in the neutralization of phonological contrasts in the written form. While this simplification may facilitate reading fluency for experienced readers, it reduces the amount of phonological information available in the text and may hinder learners' ability to develop accurate phonological representations.

Regarding Possessive Forms, the findings indicate that UBB tends to represent possessive markers consistently and in alignment with their phonological realization. This approach makes morphological boundaries and ownership relations more explicit in writing. In contrast, LAI shows variability in the marking of possessive forms, including partial marking or omission in

certain contexts. Such inconsistency may blur morphological boundaries and make it more difficult for readers to identify possessive relations solely from written input, particularly in complex constructions.

In comparison with the other grammatical elements, the representation of Negation demonstrates a higher degree of consistency across both orthographies. Both UBB and LAI employ similar negation markers and maintain relatively stable placement across sentence types. This consistency suggests that negation, due to its clearer syntactic scope and more fixed structural position, is less susceptible to orthographic variation than elements operating at the interface of phonology and morphology, such as clitics and possessive markers.

Taken together, these findings show that orthographic inconsistencies in Amanatun are not merely technical variations in spelling but reflect deeper differences in how grammatical structure is encoded in writing. Such variation has important implications for language use and literacy development. In particular, inconsistent representation of grammatical elements may reduce the reliability of written texts as sources of linguistic information, posing challenges for readers and learners who are still developing grammatical competence and literacy skills.

Finally, the study underscores the role of Orthographic Transparency in supporting the learnability of Amanatun. Orthographic practices that consistently and explicitly encode phonological and morphological distinctions provide stable linguistic cues that facilitate the development of phonological awareness and grammatical understanding. In this sense, orthography functions

not only as a system of written representation but also as a pedagogical resource that shapes language learning processes. The findings therefore highlight the importance of carefully considering orthographic design in relation to educational objectives and long-term language maintenance efforts.

5.2. Suggestions

Based on the findings of this research, several suggestions are offered for future studies, language documentation, educational use, cross-linguistic analysis :

1. For Future Research

Future research is recommended to broaden the scope of investigation by incorporating spoken Amanatun data from speakers of different age groups and social backgrounds. This approach is essential for examining the extent to which existing orthographic representations align with actual language use in everyday communication. In addition, experimental and classroom-based studies examining the effects of orthographic transparency on reading acquisition, pronunciation accuracy, and grammatical comprehension would provide stronger empirical evidence regarding the pedagogical consequences of different orthographic choices. Longitudinal studies may also be conducted to trace the development of literacy skills over time.

2. For Language Documentation

Future language documentation efforts should prioritize the development of more consistent orthographic guidelines that are grounded in the phonological and morphological structure of Amanatun. Given the

variation observed in UBB and LAI publications, documentation should move beyond data collection and address the need for harmonizing writing conventions. Collaborative work involving linguists, native speakers, educators, and local language institutions is crucial to ensure that the resulting orthography is linguistically accurate, learnable, and socially acceptable within the speech community.

3. For Educational and Community-Based Programs

In formal educational settings and community-based literacy programs, it is advisable to employ teaching materials that use a consistent and transparent orthography, particularly for beginner learners. Explicit marking of long vowels, clitics, and possessive forms can assist learners in understanding the relationship between written forms, pronunciation, and grammatical structure. Furthermore, community literacy initiatives may benefit from incorporating explicit instruction on orthographic conventions to reduce confusion arising from variation across existing writing practices.

4. For Cross-Linguistic Comparison

Further studies are encouraged to situate Amanatun within a broader cross-linguistic perspective by comparing its orthographic practices with those of other regional or Austronesian languages. Such comparative research can contribute to a deeper understanding of how orthographic transparency and standardization processes influence learnability and literacy development across languages.