

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Political Interview

In the Television or broadcast interviews for this research, the writer concentrates on the political interview between an interviewer and interviewee. Livingstone and Lunt in Martinez say that the political interview is thus part of a culture of persuasion where the elite tries to persuade and the mass consumes according to personal taste (2000: 21). Moreover Martinez adds that a classification on the interview has two differences: (a) in-depth interview, which lasts up to one hour, including the talk about analysis approach in detail for the topic and (b) short interviews, which only last a few minutes and usually focuses on an immediate, topical subject arising out of a 'hard news' story.

2.1.1 The role of Interviewer and Interviewee

According to Underhill (1987) in Sunaga (2010:454) the purpose of interview is to get answers to certain questions. The interviewer maintains his or her control and keeps the initiative as well, whatever the interviewee says in response to the questions. However, the interviewee still has a freedom to answer as he likes or to develop his comment and opinion. And then the interviewer can make the next move with another question. Similarly Heritage & Greatback (1991) in Martinez (2000:97) say that the turn-taking system for news interviews operates through pre-allocation of the turn type. In short, the turn-taking is that the interviewer asks questions and then the interviewee answers. This procedure

shows two implications which refer to orders and types of turns. The interviewer speaks first and then followed by the interviewee, and so on.

2.1.2 Structure of political interview on TV show.

In television, broadcast in political interviews is organized in interrelated routine components, so that it becomes a show that appeals to the viewer. According to Martinez (2000:165), the customarily political interview contains three structural components : (a). Headlines; introducing the topic of the interview. It can be social problems, economic, etc. (b) Story; This component provides a relevant background of information about the topic introduced in the headline. (c). Interviewee Introduction; The politicians or interviewee in this session can explain and answer the question about the subject discussed.

2.2 Disciplines Integrating Discourse Analysis as a Multidiscipline

When we discuss about language and communication, there are rules used to analyze them. Buhlers (1934) in Martinez (2000:29) believes the meaning of language must be defined systematically and structurally. He clarifies these functions belong to the norm and provide values and a certain word acquired in particular contexts and or/ situation.

2.2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis.

The study will take a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective to analyze the oral data from the interview between Desi Anwar as the interviewer and Christine Lagarhe as the interviewee on TV show.

“Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way of social power abuse, dominance and inequality that are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political contexts” (van Dijk’s,1998:1)

In his journal, van Dijk (1998:2) adds that critical research on discourse needs to satisfy a number of requirements in order to effectively realize its aims:

1. As is often the case for more marginal research traditions, CDA research has to be "better" than other research in order to be accepted.
2. It focuses primarily on social problems and political issues, rather than on current paradigms and fashions.
3. Empirically adequate critical analysis of social problems is usually multidisciplinary.
4. Rather than merely describing discourse structures, it tries to *explain* them in terms of properties of social interaction and especially social structure.
5. More specifically, CDA focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of *power* and *dominance* in society.

Similarly, Bilal (2012:206) says that CDA aims at helping the analyst to decipher the hidden boundaries and the ideologies which are prevalent in the society and have maintained their own school of thought. It is supposed that attitudes affect the way we behave in a society.

According to Fairclough (2003) in Farrelly (2011:4) view’s,CDA has three aspects to focus on the analysis:genres(ways of acting),styles(ways of being) and discourses (ways of representing). Fairclough added and explained (2003:65-86; 159-163; 123-133) in Farrelly journal (2011:5) for the three aspects is :

1. Genres are the forms of actions which a language takes when one is speaking or writing.
2. Style is the way of being that speaking or writing embodies. One can be authoritative, or humble, arrogant or reticent and so on in the way one speaks or writes.
3. Discourse is the way in which a part of the world is represented or imagined, when one speaks or writes.

In an interview on TV station issues of social and political questions must be organized systematically. In principle, the question and the answer given are properly in the context. Context is defined as the (mentally represented) structure of those properties of the social situation that are relevant for the production or comprehension of discourse (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992; Van Dijk, 1988 in Deborah Tannen, Deborah Schiffrin & Heidi Hamilton: 1998:5). But more critically, we may examine how a powerful interviewer may abuse their power in such situations, e.g., when police officers use force to get a confession from a suspect or when male editors exclude women from writing economic news (Linell & Jonsson: 1991; Van Zoonen, 1994 in Deborah Tannen, Deborah Schiffrin & Heidi Hamilton 1998).

In many interviews especially political interviews we can see who controls the topics and why the topic can be changed. The polarization of interview that characterizes shared social representations and their underlying ideologies is thus expressed and reproduced at all levels of text and talk, e.g., in contrastive topics, local meanings, metaphor and hyperbole, and the variable formulations in text schemata, syntactic forms, lexicalization, sound structures and images (Deborah

Tannen, Deborah Schiffrin & Heidi Hamilton, 1998:6). It means that critical studies are the prominence of overall strategy of Positive Self-image and attitude of the politicians.

2.2.2 Pragmatics

The theory about pragmatic phenomenon also becomes of part in this research. . Leech (1983: says that the maxims, as a part of pragmatics, form an essential part of the description of linguistic meaning in that they explain how that speakers often “mean more than they say” (1983:9). Any analytic approach, in linguistics which involves contextual consideration, necessarily belongs to that area of language study called pragmatics and in pragmatics we are concerned with what people using language are doing, and accounting for the linguistic features in the discourse as the means employed in what they are doing (Brown and Yule, 1983: 26). So, even though the interviewee in a political interview does not obey the related maxims, that conversation still runs and the viewers can receive the intended message. Pragmatics can be said as the study of how more gets communicated than is said or the study of contextual meaning. (Yule, 1996:3).

2.2.3 Grice’s Cooperative Principle and Conversational Maxims

To order the communication between the interviewer and interviewee, it is necessary that they do not only transmit the information, commitment between them but they do it in a co-ordinated way as well. In Davies (2000:2) view, Grice is concerned with this distinction between saying and meaning. How speakers

know how to generate these implicit meanings, and how they can assume that their addressees will reliably understand their intended meaning.

Cooperative principle is the principle that helps the speaker make the contribution of the conversation clear (Grice, 1975 as cited in Yule, 1996: 32). This principle in conversation is elaborated in four sub-principles that we call maxims. According to this principle, we interpret language on the assumption that its sender must obey the maxims. Cooperative principle (CP) is divided into four categories of specific maxims; there are Maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner.

1. Maxim of quantity

The rule of maxim quantity demands the participants of a conversation to give contribution as required. It can be explained as follows :

1. Make your contribution as informative as required.

(Do not say too little)

2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

(Do not say too much)

This maxim calls for us to adjust the amount of information we provide so that it is sufficient and necessary to satisfy other information needs and keep the conversation going. In other words, the speaker should not give too little or too much information. But we are not supposed to have long sentences so that we dominate the conversation and undermine the informal give-and-take as characteristic of good conversation. For example :

John : Where did you go yesterday?

Alex : Odense train stasion.

2. Maxim of quality

In order to fulfill the maxim of quality the speaker should make the contribution true. It means that he/she should not say what he/she believes to be false and should not say something which lack of evidence.

1. Do not say what you believe to be false

(Do not lie)

2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

(Do not say things that you cannot back up)

This maxim calls for us to provide a true information. When we purposely lie or misrepresent, we are not acting cooperatively in the conversation. Being truthful means not only to avoid lies, but to avoid misinterpretation as well. For example :

Fakhri : When do you want to go to Bali?

Alvin : Next week. Here, I've bought the ticket.

3. Maxim of relation

This maxim aims the participants of a conversation give a relevance contribution with the topic at that time. The participants give comments that are only related to the subject and each of them recognizes it.

1. be relevant.

(Do not say things out of the context)

This maxim calls for us to provide information related to the topic that is currently being discussed. Comments, that are only related to the subject, or that seeks an abrupt subject change when other conversational partners are still actively engaged with the topic, are uncooperative. For example:

Father : What are you doing, Son?

Son : I'm doing my homework

4. Maxim of manner

The last is maxim of manner, which says the people should be brief and orderly. Moreover, a person who follows this maxim should avoid obscurity and ambiguity.

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief.
4. Be orderly.

These maxims relate to the form of speech that you use. We should not use words that the listeners will not understand or words that have multiple perceptions. We should also not state something in a long, drawn-out way if we could say it in a much simple manner. We cooperate with our conversational partners when we choose a specific language so our partners can easily understand our meaning. For example:

Husband : Let's get kinds something

Wife : Ok, but not ice cream. The kids get a cough

2.3 The flouting of the maxims

According to Aziz (cited in Rahayu, 2011), a speaker may break a particular maxim by producing a liability to mislead other participants because of his or her unwillingness to cooperate with them. Moreover Grice (1975) discusses there are five ways of not observing the maxim; (1) flouting a maxim, (2) violating a maxim, (3) infringing a maxim, (4) opting out of a maxim, (5) suspending a maxim.

Here are some examples of flouting of each maxim :

1. Maxim of quantity

A : well how do I look ?

B : your shoes are nice

(B gives too little information; B does not say that the sweatshirt and jeans do not look nice. However, B knows that A will understand that he actually wants to say that A does not look nice)

2. Maxim of quality

A : May I go along with you ?

B : Sure, I must be late

(the fact is B objected to invite A)

3. Maxim of relation

A : How is your girlfriend?

B : it's has been raining a lot of lately, hasn't it?

(B signal to another person that he wants to move away from the topic of the conversation has been raised)

4. Maxim of manner

A : let's get the kids something

B : OK, but not I-C-E-C-R-E-A-M (spelling it out)

(the fact is her kids get cough, she does not tell her husband directly)

In a political interview the interviewee probably does not tell the truth or explain the answers too much. This may occur, for example when the interviewee has enough knowledge about the topic they are talking about and therefore avoids with giving superfluous information. Usually this is related to self-image and how to anticipate of the pressure when the interviewer gives a question.