

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion and suggestion of the present study are presented and discussed in this chapter. This chapter sums up the present study. In addition, some suggestions drawn from the present study that could be considered for other researchers in conducting further research regarding DPBE in Down syndrome is also included.

5.1. Conclusion

Motivated by Chien and Wexler's (1998) and Perovic's (2001) studies, the present study also investigates the Delay of Principle B Effect (DPBE) in individuals with Down syndrome and typically developing children. However, the present study investigates this phenomenon in Indonesian language.

By conducting the present study, it is expected that the contribution to the study of language of Down syndrome could be made. In a wider area, the present study is also expected to be able to make some contribution to Binding Principles discussion, specifically the discussion of the innateness of Binding Theory.

Elucidating the phenomenon and discovering the existence of DPBE in individuals with Down syndrome in Indonesian language are the present study's aim. To achieve its aim, descriptive qualitative method is employed and the methodology and instruments from the previous study are borrowed and adapted by using photographs and real characters depicting a set of actions.

However, the findings of the present study reveals that individuals with DS did not exhibit delay either in Principle A or Principle B acquisition since they performed above chance level. The score of DS participant in reflexive experiments and pronoun experiments is 66.67% and 68.75% respectively.

Galih Depri Lenggana, 2015
DELAY OF PRINCIPLE B EFFECT IN INDONESIAN LANGUAGE BY INDIVIDUALS WITH DOWN SYNDROME

The TDC participants did not reveal the indication of delay in either Principle A or B as well. Their score is 87.50% and 95.83% respectively for reflexive and pronoun experiments.

Despite the fact that both participants group performed above chance level, they still indicate a pattern in reflexive and quantifier. In reflexive experiments, both group scored lower than in pronoun experiments. However, this finding remains unsolved due to the explanation proposed by Perovic (2001), Jakubowicz (1984), and Ring and Clahsen (2005) regarding the participants misanalysing the reflexives as it were pronouns could not be applied. The reason why it could not be applied is that this proposed explanation could not yet reveal the cause of the participants misanalysing a lexical item as it were another.

In quantifier, both subject groups also exhibited the same: scoring lower than in name-condition. The possible explanation for this finding would be that numbers and quantifier involve a wide range of linguistic properties, i.e. syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. However, recall that almost all that range area of linguistics of individuals with DS is ‘disturbed’, the result for quantifier experiments would be much lower. Also recall that TDC at that age have been widely known to encounter no problem in such linguistic range. This explanation is rejected, therefore.

An intriguing finding emerges in the present study: pauses. Almost all participants exhibited pauses when they were responding to the questions. This pause would be caused by the verbal working memory (VWM). They seemed to need longer process to access their VWM. However, this finding is beyond the present study’s scope. Therefore, in the suggestion section, a suggestion regarding this finding would be advised.

In general, the present study is not yet able to draw conclusion that the individuals with DS encounter delay in Binding Principle B, pronoun acquisition or Principle A, reflexive acquisition. Therefore, the answer of the research

question of the present study is: the individuals with DS in the present study did not encounter delay in Principle B.

5.2. Suggestions

The present study is full of gap to be filled in the future studies. Some suggestions for the researchers interested in this field and for the future research are presented in this section.

The first suggestion would discuss the participants. The present study merely uses three DS participants. It would be much better if the number of the participants is increased so that the researcher would be able to sense pattern(s) exhibited by the participants. The age of participants also should be taken into consideration. The age difference between TD and two other DS participants is quite great. This would influence the result of the experiments as shown by the DS participants. No problem was encountered in TDC participants.

The instrument to be discussed in this section is a set of pictures depicting quantifier experiments. Some TDC participants encountered confusion when they were faced with this instrument despite the fact that they encounter the same instrument in the training session. They seemed to be confused with the characters doing the action: a picture consists of four characters, however, only three of them doing the action, the main character is doing nothing. The TDC participants did not count the main character as *semua orang* (every man). The suggestion is that in future research using similar instrument, all characters should do the actions so that the participants would not get confused.

Last suggestion could be drawn from the present study is that the pause should be considered as an important feature that possibly may lead us to other discussion relating to Down syndrome language. Moreover, this pause may mean something to the acquisition of Binding Principles.