

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

This study aims to analyze the syntactic structures and illocutionary forces of prohibition speech acts found in the Migration Act 1958 of Australia by applying theory of syntactic structures and speech act theories. The findings reveal that all prohibition speech acts identified in the selected legal corpus are realized through declarative sentence structures, while imperative and interrogative structures are completely absent from the data. The analysis also shows that prohibition is primarily expressed through word such as must not, shall not, may not, and cannot, which function as explicit markers of legal restriction and obligation. In terms of illocutionary force, the prohibition speech acts are categorized into two functions, namely forbidding of directive speech act, threatening of commissive speech act. each serving different communicative purposes depending on the legal context and objectives of the provision. These findings indicate that Australian migration law employs systematic and formal linguistic strategies to regulate behavior, establish legal boundaries, and maintain institutional authority through the use of prohibition speech acts.

Despite providing valuable insights into the linguistic realization of prohibition in legal discourse, this study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. The research focuses only on two aspects of language, namely

syntactic structures and illocutionary forces, which means that other important dimensions such as semantics, discourse organization, perlocutionary effects, and legal interpretation are not explored. In addition, the findings regarding syntactic structures are limited because all identified data belong to the declarative category, preventing a broader comparison among different grammatical realizations of prohibition. Another limitation concerns the data source, which is restricted to Migration Act 1958 Compilation No. 169 Volume 2 Parts 2–5, making the findings specific to this particular legal document and not necessarily representative of all legal texts. Therefore, the conclusions of this study should be interpreted within the scope of the selected corpus, theoretical framework, and qualitative methodology employed by the researcher.

B. Suggestion.

For linguistics students and scholars, particularly those interested in pragmatics and legal discourse, this research can serve as a useful reference for understanding the relationship between language, power, and legal regulation. These findings demonstrate that legal language does not merely convey information but also performs crucial communicative acts that regulate behavior and uphold institutional authority through carefully constructed discursive acts. Educators can also utilize this research as teaching material to illustrate the practical application of speech act theory in authentic legal texts and institutional communication. Furthermore, legal practitioners and readers

of immigration law can benefit from an understanding of how prohibitions are linguistically constructed, as this knowledge can facilitate a clearer interpretation of legal obligations and restrictions. Therefore, it is hoped that this study will raise awareness of the important role of language in legal and social regulation.

Based on the findings of this study, future researchers are encouraged to investigate prohibition speech acts from a broader linguistic perspective in order to gain a deeper understanding of their functions in legal discourse. Further research could focus on additional pragmatic aspects such as perlocutionary effects, discourse strategies, or semantic interpretations that fall outside the scope of this study. Researchers could also compare prohibition speech acts across different legal systems, legal documents, or countries to identify similarities and differences in the linguistic realization of legal authority and restrictions. Furthermore, comparative studies involving legal and non-legal texts, such as political, educational, religious, or cultural discourse, can provide deeper insights into how context influences the form and function of prohibition speech acts. By expanding the scope of analysis and data sources, future research can contribute significantly to the development of pragmatics, legal linguistics, and speech act theory