

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

#### 5.1 Conclusion

Based on the data analysis in the previous chapter, it is concluded that there are some question constructions in relation to pragmatic strategies which delivered by the barristers to the witnesses in courtroom cross-examination in Medan.

1. The types of question construction in relation to idea-targeted pragmatic strategies consist of informative question: from whom, choice question, after that, why, conjunction, prepositional phrase, which, where, and who, and tag question: full verb tag question. While, the types of question construction in relation to person-targeted pragmatic strategies consist of tag question: full verb tag question, and agreement tag question, and informative question: how far, what, and choice question.
2. The questions construction in relation to idea-targeted pragmatic strategies in courtroom cross-examination in Medan appeared and based on witness previous testimonies or responses, and from the responses themselves the barrister questioned again with type of particular challenging question. While the question construction in relation to person targeted pragmatic strategies in courtroom cross-examination in Medan also appeared and based on witness previous testimony in chief's case and in that cross-examination when it was being held, in which the response from the witness unbelievable, and casted doubt.

3. The question construction in relation to idea-targeted pragmatic strategies was constructed in the way they are because there are contradiction with previous testimonies in that cross-examination, between previous testimonies and current ones, no clarity from the witness responses, uncertainty testimony, and no affirmation from the witness. While question construction in relation to person-targeted pragmatic strategies was constructed in the way they are because there are doubt on witness testimony characteristics, and unbelievable testimony.

## 5.2 Suggestions

Based on the research findings, the researcher suggests that:

1. For further researcher who is interested in researching and discussing forensic linguistics and especially discussing question construction in courtroom cross-examination, it will also be better to measure the interrelatedness between question construction in chief's examination, prosecutor's examination, and cross-examination, so there can be measured the significances question constructions between the three.
2. It is suggested to the readers that the result of this research may become as the guidance for further research especially for the students who are interested in forensic linguistics will have much basic source and insight about the question construction which delivered in the courtroom cross-examination.