

“BUT WE’RE TALKING ABOUT HALF-BEAST HUMAN”: CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN A TELEVISION TALK SHOW WITH ANWAR IBRAHIM

Anisa Larassati (anisa.larassati@dsn.dinus.ac.id)
Faculty of Humanities, Dian Nuswantoro University

***Abstract:** This study examines how a Malaysian opposition leader, Anwar Ibrahim, flouted the Grice’s (1975) maxims during the interview in Kick Andy show. The talk show was aired in 2007 when Indonesia and Malaysia were on political dispute caused by the abusive behaviour of some Malaysians towards Indonesian domestic migrant workers. The results illustrate that the interviewee did not simply answer the questions as commonly expected, but rather flouted frequently. Several strategies of flouting the maxims such as giving overstatements, understatements, hints, and figure of speech were used. Throughout the show, it appeared that Anwar wanted the audience to believe that Malaysian government allegation (corruption and sodomy) towards him was groundless. He also showed his support for Indonesian workers and raised the issue without being asked. In this case, Anwar flouted the maxims not only to raise implicature but also to serve his particular goals as a politician, i.e. to establish a positive image.*

***Keywords:** implicature, maxims, opposition, politician, talk-show*

Language plays a significant role in determining one’s perception about others. Politicians, for example, can use language as a powerful weapon to attract supporters since public sympathy may depend on what they say. Chilton and Schaffner (2002, p. 3) conceptualize politics as ‘text and talk’ and state that ”political activity does not exist without the use of language. It is true that other behaviours are involved: for instance, physical coercion. But the doing of politics is predominantly constituted in language“. The rhetoric of politician language has been widely studied from different perspectives, such as pragmatics, discourse analysis, sociology, political science and social psychology (Li: 2008, Fetzal: 2013).

The media also becomes one of the key factors on the analysis of political language. The hybridity of political discourse in the media, especially on the structural configurations, enables the topic on politics to be discussed in different styles. The styles may shift from a strict question and answer sequences where the audience can ask questions directly to a semi-formal interview mediated by a professional host (Fetzal, 2013:5). The topic on politic can also be carried out in a talk-show style with a touch of entertainment. These different styles of conducting political interview or discussing the topic on politics may result in the different language style used by the politicians. In a political interview, both the interviewer and interviewee usually have incompatible goals. The primary goal of the interviewer is generally to seek and give as much information as possible. On

the other hand, politician often takes this opportunity to promote public image of himself or the party he represents (Li, 2008: 34).

This study discusses the language used by a well-known politician, Anwar Ibrahim, from pragmatic point of view. The data were taken from an episode of “Kick Andy” aired in 2007 by an Indonesian television channel. At the time when the show aired, Indonesia and Malaysia bilateral relation was not stable because of some Malaysians give bad treatments to Indonesian domestic migrant workers. Anwar, who is the leading person of Malaysia’s opposition party, has strong emotional relationship with Indonesia. In contrast, his relationship with the present government of Malaysia is not good. He is labelled as pro-Indonesia by the Malaysian government. Therefore, how he responded to questions about his current political view and the relationship between both countries in an Indonesian television show provided a rich set of data to analyze.

Grice’s (1975) theory on maxims and conversational implicature are used as the main framework. It examines how the subject flouted the maxim but still tried to cooperate during the interview. This study also describes the strategies of flouting the maxims and the possible intended meaning or intentions of conversational implicatures.

The Cooperative Principle and Gricean’s Maxims

When people involve in a conversation, the basic assumption is that they cooperate with each other. This basic assumption of cooperation in talk exchanges is, in most circumstances, very prevalent that Grice (1975 as cited in Yule, 1996: 37) labeled it as “cooperative principle”. He states the principle as follows: “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.”

This cooperative principle of conversation is further elaborated in four sub-principles called maxims. The four maxims, which known as Grice’s Maxim, are as follows:

- a. Maxim of quantity.
It requires the speaker to be as informative as required and to give neither too little nor too much information.
- b. Maxim of quality.
It expects the speakers to be sincere and to say something that they believe to be true. This maxim forbids the speakers to say something that they believe to be false or lack of adequate evidence.
- c. Maxim of relation.
It says that the speakers should say something that is relevant to what has been said previously. In other words, the speaker should say something which relates to what has been said before.
- d. Maxim of manner.
This requires the speakers to deliver their speech or message briefly and orderly to avoid obscurity and ambiguity.

Although cooperative principles may represent the ideal conversations and discourse participants often assume that interlocutors observe the four maxims, they are not a set of fixed and prescribed rules that people always follow during the whole interaction. Grice was fully aware of this fact. Therefore, he stated that there are four ways in which speakers may fail to observe these maxims, i.e. by

flouting, violating, opting out and suspending the maxims. This paper focuses mainly on flouting the maxims, as it is the most frequent in political discourse (Sandova, 2010: 92).

Flouting the Maxims and Conversational Implicature

Speakers may appear not to follow the maxims to trigger hearers' inferences about the speakers' implied meaning or intentions. When the speakers breach the maxims intentionally to generate implied meaning, it is called 'flouting' the maxims. In this case, the speakers' intention is not to be deceiving or misleading, but rather to encourage the hearer to look for different, or additional meaning behind what the speakers say. Flouting the maxims may enable both parties to convey and recover "conversational implicature" (Cutting, 2002: 37). Conversational implicature, or simply referred as implicature, becomes one of the most important ideas in pragmatics (Levinson, 1983: 97).

The theory of conversational implicature came from Grice's interest in the difference between what is said and what is meant. It is generated by overtly flouting the maxims. Speakers may flout the maxims to raise implicature in several ways as follows (Cutting, 2002: 37-39).

a. Flouting quantity

Information given by the speakers who flout the maxim of quantity is either too little (understatement) or too much (overstatement). The speakers may give information much more than what is asked or give additional information. They can also give incomplete information. However, this does not mean that the speaker has insufficient information, but he/she wants the hearer to infer the implied meaning.

b. Flouting quality

Speakers may flout the maxim of quality in several ways. They may exaggerate their utterance by using **hyperbole** such as "I'm starving. I could eat a horse" which does not mean that the speaker is dying of hunger and will literally eat a horse. Similarly, they can also use **metaphor** as in 'My house is a refrigerator in January' or 'He kicked the bucket'. The last two ways are by using **irony** and **banter**. Leech (1983 as cited in Cutting, 2002: 38) states the difference between the two "While irony is an apparently friendly way of being offensive (mock-politeness), the type of verbal behaviour known as "banter" is an offensive way of being friendly (mock impoliteness)."

Thus, irony is delivered in a positive way but implies negative sentiment. When someone says 'If only you knew how much I love being called at 5 am', the speaker is being ironic and expect that the hearer knows that he/she means the opposite. Sarcasm is a form of irony that is not so friendly, in fact it is usually intended to hurt such as in "This is a lovely undercooked egg you've given me here, as usual. Yum!". In contrast, banter implies a positive sentiment in an offensive way such as a tease or a flirtatious comment (Cutting, 2002: 38).

c. Flouting relation

If speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect the hearer to infer what they did not say by making the connection between their utterance and the previous utterances, as in:

A : So what do you think of Mark?

B : His flatmate's a wonderful cook. (Cutting, 2002: 39)

Although B's replay seems irrelevant. B is giving a hint for A to infer that she was not impressed with Mark.

d. Flouting manner

One of the purposes of flouting the maxim of manner is usually to exclude the third party by delivering the utterance in an obscure or ambiguous style. The following example shows how a spouse tries to exclude their child by using some 'codes' that are not easily understood by the kid:

A : Where are you off to?

B : I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody.

A : OK, but don't be long. Dinner's nearly ready.

In this conversation, B is referring 'ice cream' as 'funny white stuff' and his daughter 'Michelle' as 'somebody'. He intentionally excludes his little daughter so that she will not ask for the ice cream before dinner.

METHODOLOGY

This qualitative study is based on an episode of Indonesian television talk show 'Kick Andy' featuring Malaysian opposition leader Anwar Ibrahim. The episode entitled '*Macan dari Negri Jiran*' or "A Tiger from the Neighbour Country", approximately thirty minutes in length, was transcribed into broad transcription. This is because the main concern of this study is on the pragmatics and discourse level, especially regarding the occurrence of flouting the maxim and conversational implicature. Prosodic features and gestures such as silence, tone, and body language are not part of the analysis. Therefore, there are no transcription symbols used in this research.

The study focuses only on the conversation between the host Andy Noya and the interviewee Anwar Ibrahim. Conversational implicatures that carry meanings beyond the words as a result of flouting the maxims were analysed based on Grice (1975) framework. The ways in which the speakers flout the maxims were also discussed in detail, while the possible implied meanings or implicature were interpreted based on the context and background of the speaker. Such interpretations while guided closely by the context and background of the subject, are to a certain extent also influenced by the researcher's personal evaluation. This is because there is no post-interview conducted with the subject (Anwar Ibrahim) to crosscheck the interpretation.

Overview of the Data

The "Kick Andy" show is conducted in Bahasa Indonesia, but since the guest is Malaysian, Bahasa Melayu was also used during the show. The similarities between these two languages enable the discourse participants (the host, the interviewee, and the audience) to understand each other. Even though 'Kick Andy Show' is not a political talk show, the topic on politic is inevitable because the guest is a well-known politician.

The subject of this study is Anwar Ibrahim, a Malaysian opposition leader who is known to have a strong bond with Indonesia. He served as Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia from 1993 to 1998 and was the close ally of the then Prime Minister, Mahatir Mohammad. He also served as the Finance Minister of Malaysia. However, he subsequently becomes the most prominent critic of the

government. He was removed from his post by the Prime Minister and charged for corruption and sodomy. After six years in prison, he was released in 2004 and became the most influential figure in the opposition party. On criticizing the government, he highlights the issue on corruption and the unfair treatment he received. He also compares the free-press in Indonesia to that of Malaysia. As a result, Anwar is considered as a pro-Indonesia in his home country.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Many incidences of non-observance of Grice's Maxim occur during the conversation. This section discusses the maxims flouted by Anwar Ibrahim (AI) and the strategies used by the speaker. The results are as follows:

Table 1. Maxims Flouted and Strategies to Flout the Maxims

No	Maxim Flouted	Total	Strategies used to flout the maxim	Total
1	Quantity	17	Overstatement (giving too much information)	16
			Understatement (giving too little information)	1
2	Quality	3	Metaphor	1
			Irony	1
			Hyperbole	1
3	Relation	8	Giving irrelevant answers and irrelevant additional information	8
4	Manner	6	Obscure and verbose	4
			Hints	2
TOTAL		34	TOTAL	34

The findings show that the interviewee often flouts the maxims, especially that of quantity. It is in line with Sandoval's (2010) findings stating that the most non-observed maxim in political interview is the maxim of quantity. In the context of this study, the speaker gives detail explanation for most of the interviewer questions. However, his detail information is often irrelevant to the questions. However, generally speaking, the speaker still cooperates during the interview. The detailed answers help the audience and the interviewer to understand the whole context, even though they are too verbose. These verbosity and lengthy answers may be 'accepted' in the context of interview because the focus is on the interviewee. The interviewer normally gives the questions as the bait and expects the interviewee to explain more. Thus, answers for a short yes/no question can be lengthy but the interviewee is still considered cooperative. Sometimes, it helps the interviewee to raise other questions.

The examples of data analysis are provided in the following tables:

Table 1. Flouting the maxim of quantity and manner	Utterances	Maxims flouted	Strategies to raise the Implicature	Possible extra meanings or intentions
AN	: Setelah enam tahun anda mendekam di dalam penjara, apakah sampai detik ini anda masih merasa tidak bersalah?	Quantity	Overstatement	The speaker shows his self-defence against the allegation.
		Manner	Obscure & verbose	

AN : <i>after being imprisoned for six years, do you still think that you are innocent?</i>	Relation	Irrelevant	By using the deixis 'they', he implicitly criticizes the government.
---	----------	------------	--

AI : Bukan soal rasa. Tidak ada bukti yang menunjukkan saya salah. Itu fitnah, jahat mereka. Kalau dikatakan salah, harus ditunjukkan bukti, ini dibawa ke mahkamah semuanya tidak relevan yang saksi yang kita kemukakan tidak releven. Dan yang paling akhir saya dapati satu vidio kliping dalam tempoh bulan yang lalu dan saya tunjukkan kepada masyarakat Malaysia,

AI : ***It's not about what I think (whether I am guilty). There is no evidence that shows I'm guilty. It's a defamation, they are vicious. If they think I'm guilty, they have to show the evidence, bring it to the court. Everything was irrelevant; the witness' testimony was irrelevant. And recently, I found a video last month and I showed it to Malaysian citizen.***

AN : Apa isi vidio itu?

AN : What's in that video?

The table shows that the speaker flouts three maxims all at once. A short answer is normally expected for a yes/no question. However, he explains about the chronology of the event instead of answering the question briefly by saying 'yes' or 'no'. He also states additional information about a video that he found without being asked by the interviewer. At this point, he flouted the maxim of quantity. In addition, he starts his answer by saying 'It's not a matter of feeling' therefore he flouts the maxim of manner for not being orderly and briefly answering the question. The information he gives about finding a video is also irrelevant to the question. It encourages the interviewer to ask another question 'what is in that video?'. Thus, he flouts the maxim of relation. By flouting three maxims and using pronoun 'mereka' or 'they' which refers to the government, the speaker tries to defend himself against the accusations and to criticize the judiciary system of the government.

Another example of flouting the maxims with overstatement can be found in the following table:

Table 2. Floating the maxim of quantity, relation, and manner

Utterances	Maxims flouted	Strategies to raise the Implicature	Possible extra meanings or intentions
AN :Ini sudah di publish? sudah dipublikasikan?	Quantity	Overstatement	Shows that he is innocent and has the support of many Malaysian citizen.
AN : is it published yet? Has it been published?	Relation	Irrelevant	
	Manner	verbose	

AI :sudah di publish tapi di Malaysia kerana media semuanya dikontrol oleh partai pemerintah.. tetapi melalui youtube melalui blog melalui website itu memang meluas sekali. Sehingga kan ada, bantahan perasaan oleh duaribu, pengacara di Putra Jaya membantah kerana jelas hakim-hakim sudah dibeli, menteri sudah dibeli oleh toke-toke judi

AI : *It has been published, but since Malaysian media are controlled by the government’s party... but it went viral through youtube, blogs and websites. **It causes demonstration by two thousand lawyers in Putra Jaya, protesting because it is obvious that the judges are corrupt, the minister are paid by the gambling boss***

Table number 2 shows that Anwar flouts three maxims, quantity, manner, and relation. When asked whether the video has been published, he adds information about the effect of the video on the political stability of the country. He states that lawyers in Malaysia held a massive demonstration to show support after watching the video. Thus, his overstatement is irrelevant to the question asked by the interviewer. He also flouts the maxim of manner because he is not briefly answering the question. It is possibly to show that he is innocent and gains support from many Malaysians.

Most of the time, the interviewee flouts the maxim of quantity by giving more information than required (overstatement). The occurrence of understatement is lesser, as found in the following example:

Table 3. Flouting the maxim of quantity and manner

Utterances	Maxims Flouted	Strategies to raise implicatures	Possible extra meanings or intentions
AN : Sebenarnya apasih dosa anda kepada dato Mahatir ini sehingga dia begitu marah kepada anda?	Quantity	Understatement	He feels that he is not guilty
AN : <i>what sin did you commit that enraged dato Mahatir?</i>	Manner	gives obscure statement & hint	
AI : Andi harus tanya dia			
AN : <u>You should ask him, Andi</u>			
AN : ((tertawa)) betul juga ya			
AN : ((laugh)) well, you’re right			

When asking a question, people expect an answer. In this example however, Anwar does not provide an answer to the question. Thus, he flouts the maxim of manner as he gives obscure expression instead of clearly answering the

question. He also gives too little information (understatement) and leave the audience to guess the implied meaning or intention. In other words, he gives a hint to the listener to interpret it according to the context of the conversation. The possible explanation of this is because he feels that he is innocent and Mahatir does not have a valid reason to be mad and punish him.

Further example in table 4 shows that the speaker flouted the maxim of quality by using the metaphor 'half-beast human'. It is obvious that he is not talking about any strange creature, but rather the police officer who hits and gives him unpleasant treatments. He implicitly shows to public that the police officer is not a good person and beast-like. Again, he also gives his opinion on the judiciary system of the country. Interestingly, he gives overstatement and brings Indonesian migrant workers issue. When the interview was conducted, the bilateral relation between Malaysia and Indonesia is on a critical stage. It is caused by unpleasant treatment, such as physical torture, the Indonesian domestic migrant workers received from Malaysian employers. Anwar is fully aware of this and relates this issue to what happened to him. He brings up the issue to show his sympathy towards Indonesian workers. In this way, he may also want to get positive response from Indonesians.

Table 4. Flouting the maxims of quality, quantity, and manner

Utterances	Maxim Flouted	Strategies to raise implicature	Possible extra meanings /intentions
AN : Kenapa anda sampai dipukul? bukankah anda pejabat tinggi di negeri itu?	Quality	Metaphor	The police officer who hit him is not a good person.
AN : <i>why did they hit you? weren't you a senior official of the state?</i>	Quantity	Overstatement	He defends Indonesian labour and disagree with the government.
AI :Tapi kan kita bicara dengan orang yang separuh siluman ((tertawa)). Karena orang yang agak waras akalnya mustahil akan perlakukan. Bukan saja kepada seorang pemimpin. Rakyat biasa tidak boleh diapa-apakan begitu. Ada salah, hadapkan ke mahkamah, tunjukkan bukti dan biar mahkamah yang adil memutuskan. Tapi ini menunjukkan bahwa sistem itu sudah bobrok, sudah korup dan rusak. kalau seorang pemimpin boleh diapa-apakan begitu, apalagi rakyat biasa, apalagi orang TKI. Itu di per-	Manner	Giving verbose statement & hint	He tries to get sympathy from Indonesians.
AI : <u>but we are talking about a half-beast human.</u> <i>A good sane person won't do that. Not only to a leader, but also to a civilian. If someone made a mistake, take him to the court, show the evidence, and let the judges decide. But this shows that the system is degenerate, corrupt, and broke. <u>If they can do that to a leader, they can treat civilian even worst, let alone Indonesian labour, that's-</u></i>			
AN :Anda jangan manas-manasin saya dong			
AN : <i>don't provoke me</i>			
AI :(senyum) tapi ini yang benar andi ini yang benar			
AI : <i>(smile) but this is true Andy, this is true</i>			

Other than metaphor, the speaker also used another form of figure of speech as seen in the following example:

Table 5. Flouting the maxim of quantity and quality

Utterances	Maxim Flouted	Strategy to raise Implicature	Possible Extra meanings/intentions
AN :Ini dipukul dipenjara atau pada saat sebelum masuk penjara?	Quantity	Overstatement	He wants to show that the police treated him badly.
AN : <i>where did they hit you? in the lockup or before entering the lockup?</i>	Quality	Irony	
AI :Ya di lokap polis, ditahanan polisi. Oleh ketua polis negara. Maknanya dia jaga status saya. Tidak polis biasa dibawah. Polis nombor satu yang memukul saya			The police officer did not respect him as a deputy of prime minister.
AI : <i>In the police lockup. <u>By the Inspector General of Police of the country. It means that they tried to maintain my status. They don't let any ordinary policeman to hit me, but only the number one police of the country.</u></i>			
AN :Tapi lebih kejam			
AN : <i>but more vicious</i>			
AI :Untuk penghormatan yang besar			
AI : <i><u>to show a great honour (smile)</u></i>			

During his police custody in 1998, Anwar received unfair treatment from the police and was hit several times. The interviewer asked the location where the incident happened in which he said '*In the police lockup*'. This response is sufficient to answer the interviewer question. However, Anwar flouts the maxim of quantity by giving further information about who hit him. He also expresses his negative sentiments through irony when he said that the government only allowed the highest-rank police, Inspector General Rahim Noor, to hit him. According to him, the government did this to maintain his status as a deputy of prime minister. This, of course, means the opposite. Therefore, he flouts the maxim of quality.

Furthermore, the following example shows how the speaker flouts the maxim of quantity by giving hints and letting the audience interpret it.

Table 6. Flouting the maxim of quantity

Utterance	Maxims Flouted	Strategies to raise Implicature	Possible extra meanings/intentions
AN : Anda masih punya banyak teman disini ya? AI : <i>You still have many friends here, don't you?</i>	Quantity	Giving hints Overstatement	He is not a gay, therefore the sodomy accusation is groundless.
AI :Ya banyak sekali AI : <i>yes, so many</i>			
AN :Nah bagaimana kalau N : <i>well, what if we-</i>			
AI :Lelaki dan wanita AI : <u>men and women</u>			
AN : ((tertawa)) kita nggak usah tanya kenapa harus dijelaskan seperti itu AN : ((<i>laugh</i>)) ((<i>to the audience</i>)) <i>we don't need to ask why he need to explain that</i>			

When the interviewer informs the audience that Anwar has many friends in Indonesia, Anwar emphasises that his friends are from both gender categories, male and female. Anyone with background information about Anwar's sodomy allegation would understand what he actually means. This additional information is one of his ways to defend himself from the sodomy allegation and to state that he is not a gay.

The last example below shows how Anwar gives obscure and lengthy answer.

7. Flouting the maxim of quantity and manner

Utterances	Maxim Flouted	Strategies to raise implicature	Possible extra meanings/intentions
AN :Yang perlu kita ketahui disini juga ada satu hal, apakah anda sudah memaafkan beliau?	Quantity	Overstatement	It appears that that he is not sincere.
AN : <i>one thing we need to know here is whether you forgive him or not?</i>	Manner	Obscure contradiction	He shows his purpose to be the next leader to fix the things out. He also shows implicitly that the previous government is corrupt.
AI :Ya saya, saya maafkan. Tetapi tidak membenarkan beliau mengulangi kata nista dan sumpah dan dan fitnah dan itu tidak suatu perlakuan yang baik. Ini tidak juga mengurangi hak saya untuk membetulkan policy atau dasar pemerintah yang saya anggap sebagai curang dan merampok harta rakyat. Sama ada di jaman Mahatir atau zaman abdullah Badawi. Kalau wang billion dollar dicuri, itu hak saya, dengan pengalaman saya selaku mentri keuangan yang punyai beberapa informasi keterangan yang cukup kuat untuk memberi pendedahan supaya rakyat mengetahui. Kalau tidak selamanya rakyat mau diperbodohkan apalah lagi dengan media di malaysia yang dikontrol dikongkong, dibelenggu sepenuhnya oleh pemerintah.	Relation	Irrelevant	
AI : <i>Yes I, I forgive him. But I don't want him saying anything bad about me, swearing, defaming, and that's not a good thing. It won't erase my right to fix the government policy which, I think, not fair for the people. Both during Mr. Mahatir and Mr. Abdullah era. If billion dollars had been robbed, it is my right, to show it to public because I have experience as a finance minister and I have enough information about it. If I don't do that, people will be fooled, especially because the media in Malaysia are controlled entirely by the government.</i>			

In the example above, the interviewer asked whether Anwar forgave Mahatir. At the beginning of his utterance, Anwar says that he did forgive him. However, he goes on and saying that he wants Mahatir to stop saying anything bad about him. Moreover, he also criticizes the previous corrupt government eras (Mahatir and Badawi), showing his intention to fix everything, and participating in the next election as the candidate of Prime Minister. Lastly, he criticizes the government who controls most of the Malaysian media and restricts the freedom of speech in Malaysia.

CONCLUSION

The analysis reveals that speaker may flout different maxims at the same turn of speaking because they are interrelated with each other. The speakers can flout both quantity and relation when he gives too much information that is irrelevant to what the interviewer asked as seen in table 1 and 2. Similarly, flouting the maxim of quantity is also closely related to the non-observance of maxim of manner when the speaker gives too much information in an obscure and verbose way. Thus, it can be concluded that an utterance in one turn can be analyzed from different maxim point of views.

Furthermore, the results of the analysis show that the interviewee often flouts the maxim of quantity to criticize the government and the way they treat him. He gives more information on how he struggles to fight against the government's allegation and to participate in the next election as the Prime Minister candidate. It can be said that the maxims flouting is the self-defense strategy of the interviewee. In addition, he highlights the issue on the Indonesian migrant workers and shows his sympathy. It appears that he wants to get support from Indonesians as he shows positive evaluation and strong emotional bonds with Indonesia.

The factor that may affect the result of the analysis is the place where the interview conducted and who interviewed him. Since he is a Malaysian opposition leader and the interview was conducted in Indonesia with a large number of Indonesian audience, he may speak more freely and try to please the audience. Further study on this topic may consider to compare the result of his study to Anwar interviews conducted in Malaysia, especially as he claims that Malaysian government controls most of the media.

REFERENCES

- Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. 2002. "Introduction: themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse". In Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (Eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse*, (pp. 1–41). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cutting, J. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for students*. Florence, KY, USA: Routledge.
- Fetzer, A. 2013. Introduction: "The multi-layered and multifaceted nature of political discourse". In Fetzer, A. (Ed.), *The Pragmatics of Political Discourse* (pp. 1-18). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Li, S. 2008. "A performative perspective of Flouting and Politeness in Political Interview". *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 5(2). Retrieved from http://www.pulib.sk/skase/Volumes/JTL12/pdf_doc/Songquing.pdf
- Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J.L. 2009. *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Šandová, J.K. 2010. The non-observance of Grice's maxim in political interviews. *Theories in Practice*. (pp. 89-99).
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.