

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study of speech acts analysis of misunderstanding conversations in the novel *The Judgment* by Chart Korbjitti was conducted to examine how this novel portrays a dramatic life of Fak in conversations through the use of speech acts and the co-operative principle concept as well as the following questions;

Research Questions: How do conversations in *The Judgment* portray a dramatic life of Fak through the use of speech act and the co-operative principle?

- 1) How are conversations in the novel analyzed in terms of speech act theory?
- 2) What are the speech act typologies that can be found in *The Judgment*?
- 3) What are the flouted maxims in the misunderstood conversations in *The Judgment*?

The purposes of this research was to identify, and examine types of utterance in *The Judgment* using Speech Act Theory of Searle, categorize the utterances using Searle's taxonomy, and analyze the utterances to identify their frequency within the context of Searle's taxonomy as well as to analyze the selected misunderstanding utterances based on Grice's co-operative principle to clarify the flouting maxims for obvious meanings of conversations in *The Judgment*. For this purpose, 57 selected data from *The Judgment* utilized as study material.

5.1 Classification of Speech Acts in *The Judgment*

A total of 60 utterances from 57 data were found and categorized into each group of classification of speech acts. The results reveal that all five types of the classification of speech acts could be found in *The Judgment* as follows;

28 utterances (or 46.67%) were found to be **Expressives**, i.e. the speakers expressed their feelings or opinions through these statements of expressives were used to share opinions about Fak. It can be stated that the villagers were having negative thoughts about Fak and they often shared their opinions with each other.

18 utterances (or 30%) were found to fit in the type of **Directives**, i.e. the act of order or command. Conversations with Fak in the story were commands from people in the story. This shows that Fak was a person that could be “controlled”.

Representatives are the third type found in the novel, i.e. utterances that the speaker believes that what he says is true; 11 of these utterances were found. The speaker spoke the truth in the case of Fak’s bad behaviors which were bad things such as his drinking problem, his misbehaving and his irresponsibility in his job.

Comissives, i.e. the speaker has to commit himself to the action that will happen in the future. 2 utterances were found in *The Judgment*. The headmaster offered to lend Fak his money and to bail Fak out of the jail. It is obvious that Fak rarely received help from the other people in the village.

Lastly, **Declarations** were also found here with 1 utterance from the headmaster, in the situation in which Fak was fired from his job. The headmaster told Fak that the school board wanted Fak to leave his job. The headmaster had full authority to speak a sentence that totally ruined Fak’s career.

5.2 The Co-operative Principle in *The Judgment*

57 selected data from *The Judgment* were utilized as material for this study; 28 of these fit in the maxims of quality, relation and manner. Maxim of quantity was not found in the novel.

16 utterances were maxims of quality. This revealed that in 28.07% of the conversations, the speakers are telling something they believe to be true about Fak. Sadly, all the truth things were bad things that Fak actually committed, while 17.54% of the conversations were maxims of relation. People talked to Fak to get more information on his drinking problem. Unfortunately, the real truth about Fak and Somsong never received attention from the villagers since they thought that Fak and Somsong were having an immoral affair. The maxim of manner covered 3.51% of two utterances. The speaker using a maxim of manner made perspicuous statements to Fak.

Unlike maxims that lead to effective communication, maxims that break the co-operative principle are called flouting of maxims, found in 50.87% (or 29 utterances). The three kinds of flouting maxims in *The Judgment* are the flouting maxim of quality, manner and quantity. The flouting maxim of relation was not found in this novel. The flouting maxim of quality was found to have the highest score of all three kinds, with 21 utterances (or 36.84%). It shows that people in the story were giving too much or too little to Fak's needs. They could even exaggerate Fak's story thus leading to misunderstanding in this story. The maxim of manner is also flouted; six utterances were found in the novel. It can be extrapolated that people didn't speak clearly to Fak or they spoke to Fak ambiguously. Lastly, the flouted maxim of quantity was found in two utterances (or 3.51%) , i.e. the speaker made untrue utterances to Fak.

Searle's classification of speech Act shows the significant of types that villagers used to communicate to Fak or they used it as a tool to hurt Fak's feelings such as the villagers use of expressives that contained thoughts about Fak that never had been clarified as true. The way the headmaster controlled Fak through directive utterances show that Fak is a controllable person. Representative utterances show that people believe that Fak is not a good model of the village anymore. They also show how people keep their space between them and Fak through the use of commissive utterances, and the headmaster who has authority to dismiss Fak from his only job. Fak causes himself sadness because no one understands him. The conversations, which create the misunderstanding of Fak, slowly push Fak to be an outsider of his community.

Grice's co-operative principle also reveals that more than half of the conversation, between the speakers and fak or the speakers who talk about Fak and break the co-operative principle rule. It is clear that the villages do not co-operate with Fak to reach the same understanding in Fak's life. The villagers rarely give the right amount of information to Fak. When they try to be ambiguous with Fak, it means that they think they are able to tease Fak. They don't respect to Fak at all. They do not care about the way they talk to Fak or about Fak because they all have higher social status than Fak. And they know it that Fak cannot fight back because Fak doesn't have power to make other people respect him anymore.

5.3 Recommendation for further study

For further study on classification of speech acts and the co-operative principle, data can be collected from any kind of sources such as other novels, songs, movies or advertisements, for different results. Speech acts or the co-operative principle can also

be studied with other kinds of theories or additional theories to reveal the differences between them.



ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่
Copyright© by Chiang Mai University
All rights reserved