

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

After analyzing the utterances found in “Independence Day” drama by Peter D. Wilson, the researcher can draw some conclusions. In every utterance in the conversations among characters in “Independence Day” drama by Peter D. Wilson, the researcher found several expressions that are reflected to the use of speech act, as stated by Searle, they are representative, directive, commissives and expressive speech acts.

The characters used five kinds of speech act, they are representative, directive, expressive and commissive speech acts. The characters used representative act because they gave statement and informed based on the truth to other characters. The characters used directive act because they attempted to get someone to do something especially used “question”. The characters used expressive act because they felt cheer about the holiday and they apologized to other characters. The character used commissive act because the speaker committed to do something in the future. In the last the characters didn’t use declaration act because in this drama the character not found used declaration.

5.2 Suggestion

After drawing some conclusions, there are some suggestions that the researcher addresses, especially to those who concern with pragmatics study and for science development especially in language field. There are various topics in pragmatics which have not been explored largely. The researcher suggests that English Department students read this final project before making final project which explore other topics in pragmatics studies, such as deixis, maxims, or implicature.

For the readers especially the students of Faculty of Language and Letters of Dian Nuswantoro University, the researcher just took one kind of speech acts from one linguistic that is classification of speech acts by Searle. There are many other speech acts from other linguists which should be explored further such as speech acts classification from Austin.

For English teachers, they should give more practices in analyzing conversation in view of pragmatics.