

## CHAPTER 4 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

### 4.1. CONCLUSION

Based on a speaker's way of speaking, a listener can form his/her judgement and evaluation toward a speaker. Speaking in different style may result different perception toward speaker's credibility and other mannerisms. Such phenomenon can be found in courtroom interactions in which several speakers give testimonies before the same listeners, in this case especially judges.

Using O'Barr's theory of speech styles used in courtroom as the guideline, the study finds that there are four basic speech styles usually used in courtrooms by the witnesses and defendants in giving testimonies and each has two sub styles. They are powerful versus powerless speech style, narrative versus fragmented testimony style, formal versus hypercorrect speech style, and interruption and simultaneous speech. Besides, silence is also found in usage as another way of giving answer.

Powerful versus powerless speech style is a type of speech style which is identified based on Lakoff's proposed model of woman language features. Powerful and powerless speech style lie in a continuum in which one is in one side and the other is in the other side. A speech can be categorized as powerless style if it contains of more women language features. The features commonly found are intensifiers, hedges, hesitation, question intonations, gestures, the use of

expression 'Pak', and direct quotations. A powerful speech contains fewer features.

Narrative versus fragmented testimony style is classified based on the length of answers given to the questions. A testimony that is given in long, narrative and elaborate answers or explanation is termed as narrative testimony style. A fragmented testimony style, on the other side, contains of less incisive, brief and short explanation.

Formal versus hypercorrect speech style deals with the choice of vocabularies used in the speech. Formal speech is a speech which uses standard vocabularies or daily life vocabularies. It is a common speech which is normally used in daily conversation. It is neither less informal nor too formal. Oh the other hand, hypercorrect contains of vocabularies which are overly 'correct'. It may be an overapplication or misapplication of the rule of standard language.

Interruption and simultaneous speech is different from the previous speech styles. It is characterized by some speech overlaps and taking over of other speaker's speaking turns. There are two phenomena dealing with this speech termed as a persisting speaker and a giving in speaker. A persisting speaker is a speaker who shows some efforts to resist or defend his/her speaking turns when he/she is interrupted by other speaker. A giving in speaker is the one who does not try to hold his/her turns or gives away easily to the other speaker as he/she is interrupted.

Silence is also found in courtroom interactions as another way of giving testimony. Instead of answering question directly, a speaker may keep quiet for a

while before saying something or even remain silent. Silence can be categorized into two sub styles due to the length of pauses. The first sub type is silence with seldom and shorter pauses. The second is silence with frequent and longer pauses

These speech styles are employed by the witnesses and accused due to several conditions, such as their social backgrounds, statuses in trial processes witness, psychological states and the context in which they speak. Social backgrounds include social class, education and occupation. Statuses in trial processes cover either as a defendant, an A-charge witness, a De-charge witness or an expert witness. The psychological states can be the influences of the status of being accused or guilty feeling. The contexts of speaking here include the control of other speakers, the other speaker's speech style and other immediate situations.

From the experiment, it is figured out that each style has different effect in influencing listeners to form their evaluation toward speaker. Speaking in powerful style gives better influence toward listeners than speaking in powerless style. Narrative style produces better effects than fragmented style in influencing listeners' perceptions. Formal style as well as a persisting speaker's style generates better effects toward listeners than hypercorrect and a giving in speaker's style respectively. Hence, speakers of powerful, narrative, and formal speech styles and persisting witnesses/accuseds will be able to make listeners perceive them better. The speakers may be evaluated to be more credible, competent, trustworthy, intelligent, and truthful. On the opposite, the powerless,

fragmented, and hypercorrect style speakers and giving in speakers will attract less impression as well as silent speakers.

Based on the statistical test results, the null hypothesis of this study must be rejected and the alternative hypothesis has to be accepted instead. The statistical tests confirm that the difference of the speech styles' effects on influencing listeners' perceptions toward speakers is significant at  $p < 0.05$ ,  $p < 0.025$  and  $p < 0.01$ . It means that the probability to be wrong in rejecting the null hypothesis is 5, 2.5 and 1 out of 100 times.

Therefore, it can be explained that judges in courtrooms may also take the ways the witnesses and accuseds testify as their guidance in formulating their evaluation. They may believe speakers more if the speakers testify in powerful, narrative and formal speech style, in addition to show efforts of persistence as being interrupted by other speakers or lawyers.

Thus, it can be inferred that the problems formulated for this study can be answered and explained by using all the employed theories as the frameworks. The chosen statistical test is also able to determine which hypothesis should be accepted and generalize the result of the study.

## **4.2. SUGGESTIONS**

### **4.2.1. SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FORTHCOMING STUDIES**

From the result of the study and the weakness of the experiment study there are some issues should be considered more for the next study of the same topic. First, since the speaker of each tape used as the instrument is only one who

is either male or female, the study cannot explain whether sex may also influence listeners' perception toward speakers. Hence, it is suggested to make two tapes for each speech style, which are produced by two speakers of different sex.

Second, dealing with the number of respondents especially the experimental judges is only 30 people, for the next study the number should be increased so that the validity and reliability of the study increase.

Third, the analysis of the data should be done deeper by using more related theories as the baseline, especially those dealing with speech style and social evaluation and social attribution.

Due to several unfortunate conditions such as limited time, fund, etc, this study cannot cover all issues dealing with language and legal context. However there are several issues which may be very interesting to investigate, for there are still many questions left unanswered in this field.

Although it has been figured out that speech may reflect speaker's social background, psychological state and speaking context, there are some doubts dealing with how to detect a lie. A speaker may manipulate his/her way of testifying in such a way that it seems he/she employs powerful, narrative, and formal styles and shows some efforts to persist. Nevertheless, he/she tells a lie. Can listeners figure out that he/she lies by evaluating his/her speech style?

Other question is how to interpret and manage silence. Since there is a possibility for a speaker to be silent for a while or give no respond, the study of silence as a kind of speech style in courtrooms can be an essential study.

This study deals with the speech styles of the witnesses and accuseds in courtrooms not the speech styles of lawyers. Therefore, it may be very interesting to investigate what actually the witnesses and accuseds expect from lawyers. Whether the witnesses and accuseds may perceive lawyers differently due to the lawyers' speech styles can be a starting point to do a research. Or, is it necessary for lawyers to package their questions, pleas or accusations linguistically well formed?

Other questions that remain unanswered in the study of language and legal context deal with the legal language used in written legal documents. It is known widely that language used in acts, law codes and other legal documents has more complicated structure and unusual vocabularies. Thus, a study dealing with the written legal language can be very exciting. Do lay people really understand what the legal documents actually say? Is it necessary to reform the complicated written legal language used in Indonesian legal documents to perform better law enforcement?

#### **4.2.2. SUGGESTIONS FOR LEGAL PRACTICE**

Since it is found that speech styles used by witness and accuseds indeed influence listeners' perception differently, it will bring an advantage to use them as a strategy to convince judges about the truth of testimonies. A defender can rely on his/her witness whose speech style approaches the styles proposed in this study to attract judges. In addition, the defenders may train his/her witnesses or

accuseds to speak in the desired way if he/she finds that his/her witnesses or accuseds still have problem in convincing judges.

A litigant or public prosecutor may also use the witness' or accused's way of testifying to pursue the truth in the case. He/she can pay more attention to key witness whose speech style is less influential. Thus, he/she can use the variation of speech styles used by speakers as his/her weapon to prove his/her accusation.

On the other hand, a bench of judges may take the variation of language forms used by speakers as their guidance in making legal decision. The different types of speech styles can be very useful baseline to proceed evaluation toward different testimonies given before them.

However, based on the result of this study, it is recommended for lawyers either defenders, litigants or judges to pay attention to the importance of linguistic strategies as one of their strategies to bring out the truth before the trial processes.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY