

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Conversation is to exchange information, thoughts, ideas, and emotions. There are rules which control among participants in doing conversation. One of them is turn-taking rule, the rule between the speaker and the hearer to exchange the information. A speaker gives a chance to other speakers to comment or respond to his or her utterance, and it is repeating during the conversation. But in fact, it is broken by the interruptions. Interruption is an intrusion, a trampling on someone else's right to the floor, an attempt to dominate (Tannen, 1990). It is signaled by the act of second speaker who cuts off the first speaker's words and does not give the chance to finish his/her words.

In addition, in doing interruption as a way to convey his intention, speaker shows his communicative competence. The speaker communicative competence deals with pragmatics (Glaser, 2009). Speaker use their knowledge of a language to convey and interpret meanings. This knowledge enables them to produce and understand utterances in relation to specific communicative purposes and specific context. For example the awareness of how to modify conversation when interrupting in different context, in formal and informal context, both are different. A speech act "Could I interrupt you?" before interrupting is considered polite rather than cutting one's speech abruptly that can threat other's face to show disagreement. Such speech act called as knowledge of pragmatics that covers politeness as one of its concern.

Politeness is considered as strategic conflicts avoidance, which can be measured in terms of degree of effort and put into the avoidance of conflict, situation, maintenance, and establishment of comity (Leech, 1983). As an effort to build the harmonious relationship in communication, there is the politeness principle must be applied in communication. A polite speech is a speech which is obeying the norm of maxim (politeness principle) and it is not violating the norm of maxim's politeness. It basically involves the strategy of keeping the face in interaction, by minimizing the positive things in yourself and maximizing the positive things to others, which are generally based on four notions: cost and benefit, dispraise and praise, disagreement and agreement, and sympathy and antipathy (Leech, 1983).

In fact, turn taking violations (interrupting, ignoring selection of other speakers, not responding to prior turns) are all face threatening acts in themselves (Brown and Levinson, 1987). In addition, interruptions in ordinary conversation are generally considered inherently impolite (Leech, 1983; Brown and Levinson, 1987). Then, interruptions in political debates is also regarded impolite (Yemenici, 2001).

The fact of interruptions that threat the other face and considered impolite as previous explanations are found in ordinary conversation in daily life and political debates. There are still several setting of conversation in which politeness principle and interruptions also occur. For example conversation in the televisions program, namely talk show. Some of the talk shows programs are Indonesian Lawyers Club on TV One, Kick Andy, Mario Teguh Golden Ways, and Mata

Najwa on Metro TV, Hitam Putih, and Bukan Empat Mata on Trans 7, and many others. These programs perform information on current issues during the program among the participants involved. They invite the guests with different background in accordance with the topic discussed. A program where one person (or group of people) discusses various topics which are led by a talk show host named talk show or known as chat show (Timberg, 2002). TV One is an example of private television station that concerns on current issues. It performs many kinds of programs. One of them is talk show. Talk show program is considered the very interesting one due to it does not only perform information from one source but also clarifies the information from people who are in accordance to the problem discussed.

The participants of talk show usually want to get along with the person whom they are speaking to. But sometimes the content of conversation might change the situation, when they start a conversation could be different to later. It might be change from friendly to unfriendly, from cooperative to uncooperative. The way they deliver their opinions, ideas or thoughts to be impolite. When one participant in his/her turn of speaking, other participant cuts the current speaker's words abruptly without considering the turn of conversation. S/he interrupts the others without caring the other's face. So in this case, face threatening acts occurs.

During the conversation in talk show, among the participants, the host as interviewer or the guest as interviewee often obey or violate politeness principle for some reasons related to their illocutionary goal of his interruption. It is also occurred in political debates which their topics are specified just for political

topics that potentially threaten other's face, their reasons are also to find affable, to cause offence and to reduce competition between the addressee's purpose and what politeness claimed. (Leech, 1983). Interrupting abruptly for disagreement on what has been explained by the current speaker causes violating politeness principle due to the aim of saving his face rather than presenting his self as polite conversationalist. The example of this phenomenon can be seen in Indonesian Lawyers Club program on TV One (*episode: Anas Siap Digantung di Monas*).

RS : ...*Dari OC sudah pindah ke sahabat-sahabat saya ini. Lawyer-lawyer yang canggih.*

Dia jawab apa..., "tapi mereka gak dibayar kok bang".

Sedih gak saya dengar. Saya

HPH : ***[Itukan mulut kamu yang ngomong. Jangan asal menuduh dong..***

From the example, RS as the guest was taking his turn. But before he finished it, HS as the other guest interrupted him. This interruption was done because HS did not agree with the explanation of RS. The interruption happened after the word *saya*. It happened because HS felt RS' explanation is not appropriate with what happened. That's why he cut RS' explanation by giving the comment *itukan mulut kamu yang ngomong. Jangan asal menuduh dong* in order to RS did not continue his talk. In this case, HS violates two politeness principles at once. They are the tact maxim and the agreement maxim. HS violated tact maxim which expects to minimize the expression of cost to others and maximize

the expression of benefit to others because he did not give the chance to RS to complete his utterance as the answer from the interviewer meanwhile it was his turn to speak. Then, he violated the agreement maxim by directly showing his disagreement on RS' explanation. Whereas the agreement maxim proposes to minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other; maximize agreement between self and other. Thus, in this case, HS was considered as impolite since he attacks the other's face.

The other example of this phenomenon can be seen in Indonesian Lawyers Club program on TV One (*episode: Syiah Diusir, Negara Kemana?*).

For example:

Host : Ceritakan kronologinya dari awal sampai terjadi pengusiran.

IAM : Bismillahirrahmanirrahim. Assalamualaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh. Saya juga akan nganu..menjelaskan bahwa saya bukanlah tokoh tapi saya sebagai juru bicara teman-teman saya itu. Karena satu-satunya yang bisa bahasa Indonesia Cuma saya. Jadi saya ditunjuk sebagai juru bicara aja bukan tokoh. Kronologi kejadian saat kami keluar dari GOR itu, satu hari sebelum

Host : [Mungkin mulainya bukan dari GOR, dari...e..terusirnya dari kampung.

IAM : Kronologi itu terjadi pada 26..agustus...

From the example, the host interrupted IAM after the word *sebelum*, eventhough it was the turn of IAM to answer the question from the host. The host

interrupted IAM for disagreement on the explanation of IAM by saying *mungkin mulainya bukan dari GOR, dari....e..terusirnya dari kampung*. In this case the host obeyed the agreement maxim which aims to minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other and maximize agreement between self and other. Even though he showed his disagreement that breaks agreement maxim but he employs the word *mungkin* which mitigate disagreement on the guest's explanation. So he is considered as a polite person. Since he had effort to minimize threat to other's face.

From the example, it can be seen the politeness phenomena by performing the people who obeys and violates the politeness principle, even though the guest's answer is not appropriate to the host's question, the host tend to be polite in interrupting the guest for his disagreement and the other guest tends to be impolite for his disagreement on other's explanation on the topic discussed.

In regarding to the phenomenon, Indonesian Lawyer's Club on TV One guided by the host Mr. *Karni Ilyas* was observed because this program is one the famous talk shows in Indonesia. It was proved by the achievement of the best news and information talk show 2013 (<http://www.m.okezone.com/read/2013/03/30/33/783835/inilah-pemenang-panasonic-gobel-awards-2013>) and by the achievement of the best news and information talk show 2014 (<http://www.m.okezone.com/read/2014/04/06/533/966082/daftar-pemenang-panasonic-gobel-awards-2014>).The invited guests come from different background such as lawyers, advocates, representatives of political parties, political watch, common people, and many others. This program

brings all the latest hot news topic of the day in Indonesia, from politics, law, economy, education, and others. The discussion of topic is aimed to reveal the problem, give the information to public clearly. There are protagonist position of guest and antagonist one. Although antagonistic position are one of the characteristic of the TV interview (Lauerbach: 2007), the interviewer and the interviewee have to employ politeness to some extent, whether to mitigate a face threat that his/her question introduces or to soften the argumentativeness of his/her language in order not to perceived as “rude” by the audience. It means that they should manage their turn in terms of politeness to exchange their thought or idea in the talk show due to television as the media often serves a guidance for audiences.

Therefore, in line with the politeness phenomena in the talk show, the study tried to find out the occurrence of politeness principle in interruptions in Indonesia Lawyers Club whether in interrupting someone, the host and the guests obey or violate them during interview in Indonesian Lawyer’s Club on TV One.

1.2 Problem of the Study

The problems of the study are formulated as the following

1. What are the types of politeness principle occurred in interruptions in Indonesia Lawyers Club?
2. What is type of politeness principle dominantly occurred in interruptions in Indonesia Lawyers Club?
3. Why are those types of politeness principle occurred the way they are?

1.3 Objective of the Study

This research is aimed at examining politeness principle in interruptions in Indonesia Lawyers Club. The objectives of the study are elaborated as the following:

1. to find out the types of politeness principle occurred in interruptions in Indonesia Lawyers Club.
2. to find out the dominant type of politeness principle occurred in interruption in Indonesia Lawyers Club.
3. to find out the reason of the types of politeness principle occurred the way they are.

1.4 Scope of the Study

As stated in the previous explanations that interruptions and politeness principle can occur not only in the daily conversation but also in the talk show on the television. This study was attempted to investigate the politeness principle in interruptions in Indonesia Lawyers Club on TV One which shown by the interaction among the host and the guests. The aspects observed were the occurrences of obeying and violating the politeness principle in interruptions, proposed by Leech (1983). The data collection was based on viewing Indonesia Lawyers Club talk show.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study have two general significances, they are theoretical and practical significances.

Theoretically, the research findings are useful for:

1. the enrichment the linguistics knowledge in the field of pragmatics especially in politeness principle.
2. add up references to further studies.

Practically, the research findings are useful for:

1. Teachers, lectures, and students of university as a reference performing politeness in their daily life especially in dealing with interruptions politely.
2. For speaker and listener in daily conversation, to follow the politeness principle in order to build up harmonious communication in conducting interruption. In turn, they can create good relationship in daily