CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1.The Background of the Study

Language is the primary way of communication and a means of interaction each other. The interaction is done to express their feeling, share their ideas, and convey information. It is their tool to interact and communicate with others. Trask (2007: 93) sees language as a formal system of sign governed by grammatical rules of combination to communicate meaning. This definition stresses that human languages can be described as closed structural systems consisting of rules that relates particular signs to particular meaning.

In addition, language has an important role in our lives. Not only in daily life but also in the media such in the courtroom. In courtroom, the function of language is limited as a device to express the extent of power. As Stubbs (1996:42) argues that language and the law is now a major area of Applied Linguistics and a substantial amount of literature shows how linguistic analysis can be important for social issues. What Stubbs' argument implies is that law is inseparable from society. It is there to accord importance to empirical research of social behavior, including language that carries the law.

As Alisjahbana (1974) states that language and law are interrelated, mutual influence, even considered as the incarnation of society and culture which is otherwise also influenced by language and law. Therefore, in the courtroom, they need language to convey their thought and ideas. Through language they can protect clients and bring down their opponents. In this case a prosecutor and

lawyer in the trial must be careful in conveying their ideas, and they must pay attention to the word by word they say because it can affect their clients or the audience in the courtroom. Therefore, prosecutors and lawyers in defending their clients, they need interpersonal in the courtroom so that they can manipulate or influence their opponents to believe in the ideas they convey. Therefore, to beautify the language, interpersonal metaphor is needed in communication.

As explained above, one of the functions of the language in speech as proposed by (Halliday, 1994) is interpersonal function where the language is used to enable us to participate with the communicative acts with other people. It means here in this function we use language to interact to other, to establish and maintain the social link with them. In interacting with other, we usually tell things for purpose such as influence people's attitude/behaviour and provide information.

Interpersonal metaphor as one types of metaphors is often used by politicians or bureaucrats in order to make meaning ambiguous, but in this study the researcher used interpersonal metaphor in the courtroom interaction because the researcher wants to know the interpersonal metaphor in that place. As Saragih (2014) states interpersonal metaphor occurs in the areas of politic, diplomacy and bureaucracy. Furthermore, Halliday (1994) adds it is very common if the bureaucrat or politician more use metaphorical than literal utterances or un-congruent coding than congruent one. The use of in-congruent or metaphorical utterances by politician deals with such factors in doing interaction with other people. One of grammatical metaphor which deals with the maintaining relationship among speakers while having interaction is interpersonal metaphor. It

involves non-congruent ways of informal spoken language which concerns with establishing and maintaining relations with other people enacting interaction correlated with a tendency to draw on the resources of interpersonal metaphor involved (Xue-feng, 2010). Saragih (2014:72) states that interpersonal metaphor covers the areas of speech function in mood, modality, epithet, mental process, euphemism and connotation. However, this research only focused on metaphors of mood. There are some examples of metaphor of mood.

Such in preliminary data found below:

Hakim   : *(Membacakan dakwaan)*
(Judge)   : (Reading the indictment)
Terdakwa   : *(Diam)*
(Defendant)   : (Silent)
Hakim   : *Sudah dengar kau itu? Cocok kau rasa?*
(Judge)   : (Did you hear that? Is it Ok?)
Terdakwa   : *Iya pak*
(Defendant)   : (Yes, Sir)
Hakim   : *Itulah, kan takutnya kamu gak tau.*
(Judge)   : (That's why, I'm afraid you don't know)
Terdakwa   : *Iya pak*
(Defendant)   : (Yes, Sir)

Preliminary data above shows that the judge read the indictment about drug trafficking syndicates against four defendants. After that, the judge asked the dependants about their understanding of judge's statement. Then, the language function of this sentence "*Itulah, kan takutnya kamu gak tau*" realized as interrogative which called as metaphor of mood. In this context, as judge, he explained the defendant to admit his mistake.

Hakim   : *Saudara terdakwa memegang kunci. Kenapa tidak segera memulangkan saudara Lia*? (Judge : The defendant held the key. Why not immediately repatriate Lia?)
Terdakwa   : *Lah dia yang minta untuk tinggal di situ.* (Defendant: It's she who asked to stay there.)

Hakim	:*Saudara terdakwa anda jangan berbohong. Dalam memberikan keterangan jangan berbelit-belit. Dalam BAP anda yang punya inisiatif untuk menyuruh saudara Ria tinggal. Mana yang benar?* (Judge: defendant, don't be lie. In giving information do not be convoluted. In your BAP you have the initiative to order Ria to stay. Which one is true?)
Terdakwa	: *Ya di BAP.* (Defendant: Yes in BAP.)

Based on the data analysis above showed that the judge interrogated the defendant about rape and the use of narcotic. Language functions used in the second statement uttered by judge realized imperative mood. In this context, the second statement uttered by the judge implies emphasis. This was seen when the defendant tried to circumvent the judge's question, but then the defendant changed the answer after being pressured by the judge.

The reason of using interpersonal metaphor by politician deals with some factors, as to what Saragih (2014: 74) says that a diplomat faces human beings with feeling and emotion and therefore tries to make ambiguous meaning, where subjectivity is highly appreciated. The diplomat depends on subjectivity can make different meanings, which are transformed into harmonious and agreeable relations and a diplomatic experience is also expressed by politicians or bureaucrats. He also adds that interpersonal metaphor disperses meaning into ambiguous one (Saragih, 2014: 73). In line with it, Edelman (1985:3) states that political development and that language describes are into ambiguous because the aspect of event, leaders, policies.

In addition, interpersonal metaphor also occur in order to negotiate or in other cases avoiding negotiation. Thompson (1996: 172) explains that in interpersonal metaphors the non-negotiability associated with nominalization can

clearly be a powerful weapon in cases where the speaker or writer wishes, for whatever reason, to avoid negotiation, with its possible outcome of rejection. While, Interpersonal metaphor is a strategy for expanding the potential for negotiation (Halliday, 2004: 637). It means that the possible used negotiation or avoid negotiation based on the genre of the interaction or text.

Related to the topic in this study, the researcher found there have been a number of researchers dealing with interpersonal metaphor. Adejare (2014) also applied the same theory investigated "The Manifestation of Mood and Modality in Texts" there is a dearth of studies on mood and modality as a focus. This study examines their manifestation in texts. Results show that mood recurred far more than modality. However, modality was higher than interrogative mood and imperative mood and was more frequently occurring in segments of the lesson involving strict computation. The study confirms WILL and CAN as the most recurring modals.

Aritonang (2014) also conducted a research in linguistic field in the Impact of interpersonal Metaphor on grammatical intricacy and lexical density in the text of presidential debate between Barrack Obama and Mitt Romney. He found that both types of interpersonal metaphor namely metaphor of modality and metaphor of mood are found. In terms of metaphor of modality, the three values namely high, medium, and low are identified. The presence of interpersonal metaphor utterances also make the debate carry with it more features of spoken language and fewer features of written language. This can be seen through several aspects such as immediacy of feedback found in the debate which is categorized as

immediate feedback, every lexis, hesitations, non-standard grammar, grammatical complexity and less nominalized utterances.

Moreover, Purba (2017) investigated interpersonal metaphor in "Indonesia Now" English news TV program based on Systemic Functional Linguistics approach. The objective of the study are to identify what types of interpersonal metaphors in "Indonesia Now", to describe how those interpersonal metaphors are used, and to explain in what context those interpersonal metaphor are used. The findings of the study show that there are five types of interpersonal metaphor used in "Indonesia Now", namely metaphor of mood, modality, epithet, euphemism, and connotation. The use of interpersonal metaphor in "Indonesia Now" is realized by use of incongruent types of expressing meaning in interaction. Overall, her research study gives many contributions to this study because use the same theory.

This study refers to the use of interpersonal metaphor in the "Courtroom Interaction". Myers (1990) states that courtroom is a miniature of the social world, which is human relations. It means that in the courtroom there is a process of mutual influence between law enforcement officers, namely judges, prosecutors, lawyers and even the public. Each of them has their own duties and functions in the room. As with the presiding judge the task is to see both the position of the party and the facts in the court to then decide on the case. While the prosecutor was in charge of carrying out the investigation, making a trial file then prosecuting the defendant with the claim at the trial. Then the lawyer is in charge of defending the defendant. Based on each task, they must have their own style of

communication and convey their ideas. Therefore, the law of enforcement needs interpersonal metaphor in courtroom interaction.

Courtroom is not going to be concerned in making this study, but what is going to be concerned in this study is the language use. Simply it can be mean that, this study is focused on interpersonal metaphor in the courtroom interaction. There are some reasons for choosing interpersonal metaphor used in the courtroom interaction as the object of the study. First, this courtroom is known for indirection in their behaviour, especially the speakers and the participant talk about unfamiliar things. Second, in the courtroom there are many cases such as divorce, theft, murder, drugs, and other criminal acts. Because the language used in the courtroom is different among the speakers and participants who are the suspects in the case.

Finally, this study was focused on interpersonal metaphor in the courtroom interaction which is rarely found or conducted due to the limitation of data sources. These facts serve to be a motivation to conduct the present study dealing with interpersonal metaphor used in the interaction in order to find out what kinds of interpersonal metaphor of mood and the realization of interpersonal metaphor of mood used in the courtroom interaction.

1.2. The Problems of the Study

Related to the background of the study, the problems of the study were formulated as the following.

1. What types of interpersonal metaphors of mood are used in the courtroom interaction?

2. How are the interpersonal metaphors of mood realized in the courtroom interaction?

3. Why are the interpersonal metaphors of mood realized in the way they are?

1.3. The Objectives of the Study

Related to the problems of the study, the objectives of the study were formulated as the following.

1. To investigate types of interpersonal metaphors of mood are used in the courtroom interaction.

2. To reveal how the interpersonal metaphors of mood realized in the courtroom interaction.

3. To explain the reasons of interpersonal metaphors of mood realized in the courtroom interaction.

1.4. The Scope of the Study

This study was applied the concept of the systemic functional linguistics (SFL) which proposed by Halliday and Saragih. The study focused on analysis of interpersonal metaphor of mood realizes by the judge's clauses in the courtroom interaction. Specifically, the researcher took two narcotic cases and one robbing case in the courtroom interaction.

1.5.The Significance of the Study

The findings of the study were expected to be useful as the following in terms theoretically and practically.

a. Theoretically

It was expected that the findings of this research will give much contribution and insight to applied linguistics, particularly to forensic linguistics about interpersonal metaphor. In addition, the findings will enrich more horizons to linguistics theory.

b. Practically

It was also expected that the findings of this research will give more information to the readers, and particularly the law of petition in proposing or in constructing the utterances to witness and dependant in the courtroom interaction in order that the case which is going on can be finished more effectively.