

## CHAPTER FIVE

### CONCLUSION

This chapter presents conclusions of the study. These conclusions are the summary generated from the findings of the characterisation and speakers and power which have been discussed in Chapter Four of this study. This chapter also discusses the limitations of the present study and offers some implications of the study. Some recommendations are also provided as to give more information as well as guidance for future researchers who are interested in doing an analysis on plays.

#### 5.1 Conclusion

As the findings being discussed, then, this present study will give a conclusion. Going back to the Chapter One, the first research question is to find out how the impressions of the main character are formed in the play. To obtain how the impressions are formed, the theory used is characterisation that is presented by Culpeper (2014). As seen in the findings, this study reveals nineteen impressions of Willy. The impressions are obtained from 144 samples. This study finds out that Miller uses the textual cues—explicit authorial cues, explicit non-authorial cues, implicit authorial cues, and implicit non-authorial. Miller uses most of the cues. He does not use self-presentation in the absence of other characters. Mostly, the impressions are obtained in implicit cues. This means that Miller gives attention to his main character. He dominantly uses syntactic features to form the impressions of Willy. Syntactic features are about sentence structures, tenses, and speech functions. Moreover, Miller gives general impressions of Willy in the beginning of the play. It is the style of literary works in which the readers are given impressions in the beginning. Besides, Miller gives impressions of Willy mostly in non-authorial cues. Thus, the readers must obtain the impressions according to their awareness. This may show the style of Miller. He wants the readers to experience obtaining the impressions by themselves. This study also reveals that Miller gives two contradictory characteristics. This study believes that Miller wants to raise the readers' curiosities. Stylistically, this shows Miller's

characterisation style. Furthermore, from the nineteen impressions, Miller gives fourteen impressions of Willy's characteristics. This indicates that Miller focuses on Willy's characteristics.

The second research question is about power relation between the significant characters—Willy and Biff Loman. The theory used to reveal the power relation is powerful and powerless speakers elaborated by Short (as cited in Burke, 2014). There are twelve questions that show power relation. From the finding and discussion, this study finds that Willy is the powerful one in Act One as he dominates the twelve conversational features that show powerful speakers. Thus, from power relation, Willy is the powerful speaker in the play whereas, Biff is the powerless speakers. This may indicate Miller's style. The conversation is led by the main character. Willy is the most significant character than Biff. This makes the readers focus on Willy.

Both characterisation and power relation are able to be used to analyze play scripts. The theories can show how the impressions of characters are formed in more details. The theories do not only show physics and characteristics of characters but these also show their relationships. Thus, Miller is successful in showing the readers what kind of character Willy is.

## **5.2 Limitation of the Study**

The study is subject to several limitations. The first limitation relates to the play. There are two acts in the book. Yet, this study analyzes Act One as it is believed to have many information about the character. Moreover, Act One has 51 pages.

Then, the second limitation relates to the characters in the play. There are a lot of characters in the play. Yet, in seeking how the impressions are formed, this study only focuses on Willy, the main character. Willy mostly appears from the beginning to the end of Act One. In seeking the power relation, the theory given by Short (as cited in Burke, 2014) needs at least two characters as this is a

conversation theory. Therefore, this study chooses a character that is believed significant. The character is Biff Loman, his son.

This study seeks how the impressions of Willy are formed by using Culpeper's theory of characterisation. Culpeper (2014) says that there are three cues—explicit, implicit, and authorial. All of the cues are used to reveal how the impressions of Willy are formed. Then, this study seeks the power relation between Willy and Biff Loman. The theory used is powerful and powerless speakers. Short (as cited in Burke, 2014) gives twelve questions to reveal the power relation. This study focuses on the two main theories.

### **5.3 Implication of the Study**

The findings of this study contribute to characterisation and power relation theories. The present study shows that characterisation that Culpeper (2014) gives is applicable to the play. Moreover, power relation theory that is described by Short (as cited in Burke, 2014) is also suitable to the play as it can reveal power relations among characters.

This study offers some information for the researchers who want to analyze their researches using characterisation and conversation analysis in Stylistics. This also gives suggestions for those who use Stylistics as their basic theory. Besides, these days, both of the theories may be rare as the theories are applied to plays. Most stylistic analysis nowadays uses novel, poems, and films as the data.

For the readers, they are able to feel closer to the character because the readers can know deeper about the character as they can know the how impressions of the character are formed and the power relation too. Besides, the readers can think more critically when they read literary works. This study may also show the readers what the playwright wants to convey in the work.

For the writers, this can be suggestion for creating characters. It is suitable for the writers who write novels and plays as those have conversations.

For the field of Stylistics, this thesis can give a reference about characterisation where not many researchers do the analysis. Whereas, the use of powerful and powerless speakers may be rare too. This thesis can enrich researches in Stylistics.

#### **5.4 Recommendation for Future Research**

Considering the limitation of this research, the researcher suggests that future studies should focus on more interesting characters if they want to analyse using characterisation. By choosing interesting characters, their studies may be interesting to be read. Moreover, the researcher suggests to choose famous or interesting books. So, their studies may be read by a lot of people.