

ABSTRACT

Naning Sudiarti., *A Study of The Speech Styles Used in Courtrooms and Their Influences on Legal Decision Making Processes*. This thesis is submitted as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Sarjana Degree at English Department, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Airlangga University , Surabaya, 1999.

Everyone may adopt many kinds of ways of speaking for different circumstances. Yet, he/she cannot hide his/her own original speech style. The way of speaking may reflect the speaker's social background, psychological state and also the influence of speaking context in which he/she involves. Hence, from the speech style he/she used, listener(s) can draw their inferences about what kind of person he/she is, or even his/her personality traits and other mannerisms.

A trial process is an unique linguistic phenomenon in which many people present almost similar or different testimonies in many different ways of speech style before the same listeners, in this case the bench of judges. Meanwhile, the testimonies given may be very essential legal evidence from which judges decide legal verdicts.

This study is done to investigate what kinds of speech style usually employed by speakers, in this case witnesses and accuseds, to give testimonies. In addition, it is also done to figure out whether different kinds of speech style may generate different effects toward listeners in evaluating speakers.

From the observation, it is found out that there are four basic styles usually used in courtrooms. They are powerful versus powerless style, narrative versus fragmented testimony style, formal versus hypercorrect speech, and interruption and simultaneous speech. Besides, silence is also found in use as another way of answering question.

Meanwhile, from the experiment it is figured out that those styles indeed generate different effects toward listeners. Listeners will evaluate speakers differently because of the influences of the speech styles. Therefore, in real courtrooms, it can be inferred that judges may also evaluate witnesses' and accused's trustworthiness, convincingness, competence, intelligence and truthfulness differently.

CHAPTER II

INTRODUCTION