SPEECH STRATEGY USED BY MODERATOR FOR REVEALING VALUABLE INFORMATION IN DISCUSSION

MalikatulLaila

English Department FKIP-UMS

Email: mal201@ums.ac.id

Abstract

To reveal information within a discussion, moderator usually implements strategies to leverage the addressee to arouse more responses. This paper aims to investigate moderators' speech strategies in tvOne discussion, Indonesia Lawyers Club (ILC). The data were utterances during the session of discussion collected by using purposive sampling and the results areten different topics performed onevery Tuesday night from 8 to 11 p.m. in 2012. The technique for analyzing data iscomprehensive analysis referring to pragmatic context both for the strategies of speech act by Searle (1979) and maxims of Cooperative Principles by Grice (1989). The findings show that the most powerful moderators' speech strategy used to reveal information is directly literal speech act strategy, with the variations of: (1) signaling the adressee with/or without speaking verbally;this signal of non-verbal language is used to show and reveal intimacy; (2) repeating the addressee's words to show more response to the addressee; (3) using suggestingformula to give respect, especially to addressee with higher status; (4) making counter to ones' opinions to prove the realinformation;and (5) presenting polite criticism to remark the answer, in which the latter presented less indirectly.

Keywords: *Directly literal speech act, speech strategy variations, open-area, and ILC.*

Malikatul Laila. A postgraduate student of Pragmatics Linguistics in Sebelas Maret University and currently an English lecturer in English department, faculty of Teacher Training and Education of Muhammadiyah University. She has profound interest in topics dealing with language is the study of Pragmatics.

1. Introduction

Moderators' speech strategy in discussion has become increasingly impressive over the years since its prominence offered various techniques for leveraging participants to talk. Here, the role of moderator in discussion is significantly needed because he/she becomes the main leader in managing the audience to conduct a successful mission of discussion. Moderators' speech strategy in discussion has related view in some previous studies. Among others are the work of Macauly (2001), Hess-Lu¨ttich (2007), Purnanto (2009), and Clayman (2010). Moreover, the topic of moderators' speech strategy has warmly been searched by language students such as Amaliah (2011), Rosnilawati, Ermanto, and Novia Juita (2013), and Wulandari (2013).

Macauly (2001) viewed that request for information is resulted differently based on different gender. He stated that female interviewer in discussion preferred using indirect speech strategy. Indirect speech strategy, for Macauly refers to the strategy in speaking where utterances have different

intentions from the modes of the sentences. In the course of getting response using indirect speech strategy, request is more reasonable to get provocative and polite result. In addition, by having the provocative types, the female interviewer had successfully elicited more information from many interviewees. The difference from Macauly's theory, indirect speech strategy used by ILC moderator is directed to the addressee by considering the status of the addressee, while the similarity lies in having polite result of speech strategy.

Hess-Lüttich (2007) proposed positive thinking when asking the participant; his way of asking to a guest is called 'protection strategy' by Burger (1991:190–197). This strategy is meant to allow guests to appear in a good light. It means that the guest was given the opportunity – though not too directly, as that would be too crude to portray himself (or herself) positively. A bit contradictory is that when the main role of moderator to lead a discussion is sometimes violated by his taking part of the discussion and seems proactive to one side of participants.In this strategy, it is the role of moderator to make controversies during the participants' presenting the information.

In Purnanto's work (2009), the criminal session is led by a judge where the function is like moderator. The moderators' speech strategy is held in a courtroom and the process of revealing information is termed as the strategy of questions and answer. Purnanto viewed that the moderators' speech strategy used in the courtroom is much influenced by the participants' different social status as the background for producing the various realizations of speech acts. Moreover, the speech act realizations used in the courtroom are dominantly resulted from the judge's strategy of questioning to hearers, such as to the defendants, lawyers, witnesses, advocates, and audience. The way the judge questioned to the defendants has closely related to the strategy of moderator in revealing information from the audience in ILC discussion.

The strategy of interviewer in using the address terms by Clayman (2010) in (Lerner, 2003) within interaction had functioned variably to the recipients' view on the use of the moderators' speech strategy. In this paper, the term 'revealing information' is used similarly to search for information during the process of the moderator's activity in asking questions to the participants in a discussion.

The theoretical bases used to analyze the strategy for revealing information in ILC discussion refer to the strategy of speech acts by Searle (1979) and maxims of cooperative principles by Grice (1979) as in (Coulthard, 1992: 102-109; Thomas, 1995: 63-77; Wijana, 1996: 33-36; Archer Dawn, Karin Aijmer, and Anne Wichmann, 2012: 51-53).

The aim of this article is to explain the types and intentions of the moderators' speech strategies for revealing information during the interactions within the discussion of ILC.

2. Research Method

The type of this research is descriptive qualitative. This means to identify the various types of speech strategy description especially for revealing information within the ILC discussion, the writer describes and elaborates the typical moderators' speech strategies which are used during the session of ILC discussion. The moderators' speech strategies being indicated have closely related to speech acts of the moderators with the variations of signaling being regulated by the turn between the moderator and the addressee.

The data of the study are conversational speech taken from the participants of ILC discussion, which occurred during one year, in the year 2012. The sampling used is purposive sampling with the resulted samples are ILC shows with 10 different topics, among others areviolence, representatives' rapport of work, drug abuse, officials' campaign, corruption, case of terrorism, law for common people, and other criminal reports.

The technique of data analysis used was a comprehensive analysis of language use by referring to pragmatic contexts and discourse approach considerations (Cutting, 2008; Archer et.al., 2012). Pragmatically, the identification of the moderators' speech strategy is firstly based on the participants' speech acts (Searle, 1979; Wijana, 1996; and Purnanto, 2009) which are not only based on speech uttered separately either by moderator or addressee, instead, considers to the whole discursive process of eliciting for information which is well termed as 'exchange' (Coulthard, 1985). Moreover, the

identification of moderators' speech strategy the writer used also refers to Grice's observance and non-observance maxims in cooperative principles (Thomas, 1995; Archer et.al., 2012).

3. Finding and Discussion

The result of the study shows that the moderators' speech strategies to reveal communication used by the moderator in ILC discussion are mainly influenced by different social status of addressees, such as: lawyers, common people or victims, authorities or representatives, experts or politic observers, tertiary students, and all the other participants in the discussion.

First, when the addressee are lawyers, common people, or victims, the main moderators' speech strategy used by the moderator is directly literal speech with such variants as: (a) questioning directly and literally by signaling to the addressee, (b) repeating the addressee's response, and (c) making a counter or showing a refusal. Sometimes, the moderator's use of insult is directed to make an intimate relation to the recipient, especially to common people. He still presents it in a humorous way as this characterizes himself as being in an "open-area"type of person (Luft, J and Ingham H, 1955) whose character has already been recognized by other people. Whatever the moderator speaks, he has not stimulated his action as if to show good manner to others; instead he acted his inner character as objective as possible.

In the example below, the moderator uses the strategy of direct and literal continued by repeating a part of addressee's utterance (Anwar) "there isn't yet" to mean 'intentionally get more complete information of what is the next'.

A. Context: O1 is moderator (Karni Ilyas); O2 is lawyer (Anwar Fuadi); both O1 and O2 have close relation and arefamiliar; the topic is about confirmation of Hanging Law Execution in Indonesia, and the speech situation is informal.

> Karni :(1)   ...   *Itu   yang   sayakatakantadi,   yang sayaingintanyadariandasalahsatusistempemidanaanakitaadatidakhukumandigantung*?
>
> '... That was I said, what I want to ask to you is about the system of criminality, <u>is there or not a hanging execution</u>? ((Signaling to point the addressee))'
>
> Anwar : (2) *e...Sampaisaatinibelum,*
>
> 'er..Up to now, <u>there isn't yet,</u>'
>
> Karni : (3) *((menyela)) Kalaubelum...*
>
> ' ((insisting)) If there isn't yet...'
>
> Anwar :(4) *((melanjutkan)) Kita ditembakhukumkita, hukumgantungitudulujaman Maria Antonetitudulu ((pesertabersorak)). Iyakan ((sambilketawa))?RevolusiPerancis.*
>
> '((continuing)) <u>Being shot is our law, the hanging execution was formerly done in the time of Maria Antoinette (the participants areshouting), wasn't it ((laughing))? French Revolution</u>'.
>
> Karni : (5) *Sampaitahun 45 sejarah Indonesia ituhukumgantung, jadigakusahjauh-jauh. KUHP kitaitu pun hukumgantung, itubarudiubahtahun 50an. JadijanganterlalujauhkePerancis ((beberapapesertaketawa)).Apaajapempidanaan di Indonesia*?
>
> 'Up to the year 1945, historically, the law enforcement in Indonesia is hanging execution, <u>so don't discuss it too far.</u> Based on the Criminal Law Rules, it was the hanging execution being applied. Then, in about 1950, the law had been changed. Thus, don't say too far until French (few participants are laughing). What rules of criminality are there in Indonesia?' (Data: ASDM/13Mar12).

The moderator asked a question using a directly literal strategy by signaling to point the lawyer (1). A form of question is used to conventionally mean asking something ('whether or not there is a hanging

execution in Indonesia'). Moreover, since the lawyer only gave a short response (2) which for the moderator it was not a complete information; then, he continued by repeating the lawyer's answer (3). This is done just to elicit more information about the fact of hanging execution in Indonesia. So, repeating the addressee's answer is one of variation within the use of directly literal moderators' speech strategy in which it functions to enhance the addressee in eliciting for the information within the interaction.

In the meantime, the lawyer's answer (4) represents his strategy of opting out maxim; he tends to avoid discussing the hanging law execution in Indonesia, instead, he makes illustration of the hanging law execution by comparing to that occurred in French Revolution, during the era of Maria Antoinette. Because of close relation, as good friends, the lawyer was easy going to answer the moderator's question after being insisted by the moderator. The lawyer answered by choosing the opting out maxim strategy besides to recall by showing up to the audience in memorizing French revolution, he tried to avoid misunderstanding of giving information especially about the enforcement of hanging law in Indonesia. That's why the audience have altogether known (indicated by participants' shouting and laughing) that the lawyer alternates the focus of discussion. Making the alternation of topic just to hide the real information and presenting the other things which are referred to as the strategy use of opting out maxim.

Both the moderator and the lawyer have similarly relevant status. This is shown by the fact that the moderator (Karni Ilyas) is an experienced journalist whose current profession is as a news director at tv One and formerly had ever dealt with the criminal case he observed to report, while the lawyers are people who have knowledge of law and they often take a role as the advocates who may save or defeat the accused person. The dominant strategy used by the moderator to reveal information from the lawyers is the use of directly literal speech act strategy. In varying the directly literal strategy, beside signaling and repeating, the moderator pointed the addressee by making a counter (5). The moderator refuses the lawyer's giving information by saying a negation:"*gak sah jauh-jauh*" ('don't discuss it too far') as his way of making a counter of his idea.

Sometimes, the moderator's making counter to the addressee's idea is purposely done at the same time as to state his perception of one's fault, and although the person to say has already felt guilty. Even the two participants have made a counter to each other as to save their own face in accounting for an idea. This can be seen as in the following example.

B. Context: O1 is Moderator (KarniIlyas), O2 is the speaker of Committee of Corruption Watch (Johan Budi), the topic is about the court sentenceof the defendant (AndiMalarangeng) spoken by the leader (Abraham Samad), and the situation is formal.

Karni: (1) <u>*Kenapaandaharusmenyebuttersangkadengan AAM*</u>, *gakadadiduniapakaiinisialtersangka. Di Amerika, di Inggris, di Arab, di Australi, di Cina, namalengkap.*

> '<u>Why should you mention the defendant with the abbreviation AAM</u>, however there isn't an initial for a defendant in any country. The US, England, Arab, Australia, and China all use a complete name.'

Johan: (2) <u>*Iyasayakirasayatidaksalah*</u>*menyebut AAM ya, gakadaaturan yang mengatakanbahwa...*

> '<u>Yes, I think I am not mistaken</u> in mentioning AAM, There is no rule to say that….'

Karni: (3) *((menyela))* <u>*Gakseolah-olahudahbersalah*</u>*. Kalau orang ditutupmatanya, namanyadisingkat.Kalausayamenafsirkanmalahbukankitamelindungi, malahmembuatdiabersalah.*

> '((interrupting)) <u>No, as if it is mistaken</u>. When a person's eyes are made closed, his named is abbreviated. If I interpret it, we won't protect him instead make him guilty'.

(Data: YTDN/11 Des/12)

The moderator's use of directly literal strategy (1), questioning to ask the reason of using abbreviation AAM, has been responded by the addressee by refusing the moderator's perception (2). Since the O2's status is still relevantly equivalent to O1 in the case of law knowledge and experience, the refusal statement response of the O2 has been perceived polite. This is reasonable of being is mitigated by such a clausal hedge such as "yes, I think...." In addition, while O2 tries to give the argument response, he was interrupted by the moderator (3) by stating a counter too. This second counter from the moderator is a form of repair of utterance (2) which is indicated by the negation "no".

The case of moderator's repair as in A (5) and B (3) above has implicitly shown the power and authority of moderator in managing the discussion. He has firmly stated a counter utterance by continuing more other reasonable statements while the addressee has accepted it unavailingly. This using ofdirectly literal moderators' speech strategy with various intentions is due to close relation factor between the moderator and the addressee (lawyer). This is reasonable, especially when trying to make no distance with the addressees; the moderator can lead the lawyers to give more elaboration on the information needed. On the other hand, most lawyers respondedby using opting out moderators' speech strategy in order that they may keep the case a secret from the public or keep respect to their client from being exposed in the discussion. Actually, the lawyers' response to the moderator was a non-observant maxim and this is done by applying direct non literal moderators' speech strategy. This is so, because both the moderator and the lawyer have the same background on having the knowledge and experience of law and both have often met to discuss some current problems as in the ILC discussion.

The moderators' speech strategy of directly literal indicates the moderator's authority in expecting the honest, brief, and fair response from the common people or victims. Actually, the moderator wants to expose the addressee's case frankly, so that the other participants in the discussion may recognize the problem and implicitly they want to assist the victims, especially when being put in the controversial law reinforcement. For example, on a condition when a poor victim saidthat he was given hard punishment due to stealing worthless or even priceless things as compared to high status officials as victims of corruptor who was finally claimed free without a jail sentence.

In turn, the poor victims' speech strategies of giving information to the moderator were applying the observant maxim, especially the relevance maxim. This is considerable as they were objectively presenting what they had actually done and experienced and they had agreed to release the hard burden of their life. Their objective arguments presentation in the ILC discussion were intended to assist them until their problem was solved, or at least, the hard punishment would be reduced.

Second, when the addressees are authorities, representatives, experts, or political observers, the moderator's tendency of using speech strategies were mainly indirect-non-literal strategy and suggestingformula. The use of suggestingformula is usually a consequence of the addressee's higher position than the moderator. The principle use of suggestingformula contains certain suggestion to do something (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989), while in socio-pragmatic study, a speaker of lower status or rank asks something to do towards a hearer of higher status, the utterances is categorized as request, a sub section of directive speech act. A request utterance of male speaker tends to be in the forms of asking about something directly literal, rational, and to the point (Prayitno, 2009). In the use of suggestingformula, anyway, the moderator needs to respect those having a higher status. Whenever the moderator saw the experts give unwise comments to the accused, the moderator had courage to warn the experts. For moderator, experts had to givea fair and objective consideration if they would give comments to the victims. Even if the victims were a person having high status. For the sake of humanity, giving respect to the accused in whatever the current case becomes obligation of everyone.

C. Context: O1 is the moderator (KarniIlyas), O2 is Saud UsmanNasution (in charge of Human Relation Division of Indonesian Republic Police). The relation of moderator and the addressee is not close and the situation of the conversation is formal because the adressee has higher status than the moderator. The topic is about the police being late in anticipating chaos events, and the situation is formal... .

Karni*: Iya, polisiitudianggapterlambatkarenaselaluketket...ketikagejalamauterjaditawuran, konflikhorisontal, itutidakpreventif yang dilakukan. Barudatangsetelahtigatewassi SPAD barupolisinyadatang. Sebelumnyagakada.Begitujuga di berbagaidaerah.Penyerbuansudahterjadi, pembakaransudahterjadi, baru e...polisidatanguntukbertindak.Makapolisidianggapterlambat. ... Jadi, apikecildibiarkanbarudatangketika<u>apisudahmenghanguskanrumah. Itu yang dianggap orang membiarkan.Apatanggapanpak Saud?</u>*
’Yes, the policeman was thought late because he didn’t prevent previously when there was an indication of attack, horizontal conflict. He, the policewould have just arrived after the victims died. Before the incident, he was not there. This also occurred in the country. The attack had occurred, the fire had flamed out, then the police just came to take action. Here, the policemen were late. ... <u>Therefore, a small fire was let burning, then they just arrived when the fire had already burnt the house. That was as people said they let the case.</u> What did you think, Mrsaud?’

Saud *: Kami kiratidaksampaisepertiitu, kitaharuspilah-pilahdulupermasalahanya. Bilamanapermasalahan-permasalahansosialpermasyarakatan, kami tidakbisaterlalujauhmencampuri... .*
’In my opinion, it was not like that, we should have sorted out the case firstly. When it was the case of social problems in society, we could not interfere too far... ’. (Data: KPMK/29 Feb 12/Pej).

The moderator’s speech strategy as in the underlined sample (C) above is an indirect non-literal strategy. It is indirect because the underlined utterance above does not mean to send theinformation about the late police’s arrival in the a fire event to O2; instead, to offend the authority’s (Police Human Relation Division Leader or *KadivHumasPolri*) work’s being late in anticipating the problem. So, such an underlined utterancewas not to discuss about the fire event literally but the metaphorically states its irony. Metaphorically, the moderator had offended the police’s responsibility in managing a case. The police was said to be too late to anticipate a chaos, while the case was emergently managed as it was in a very dangerous position.

Revealing information by applying technique of offending metaphorically, the moderator, in one side had an intention to respect the authority and representatives. On the other side, he also intended to raise their emotion; accordingly, feeling being defended by the moderator, they want and eager to give more information about related to their careless duty.

Third, when the addressee is the whole audience of ILC discussion, the moderators’ speech strategy is declarative speech. The declarative speech strategy is a speech act which results in bringing about the state of affairs. The requirement of this strategy is that the speaker is a person who is known to others as having main roles over the addressee. That’s why in his use of declarative strategy, the moderator may control the whole audience by his louder greetings and use certain performative verbs to characterize his speech. Usually a formula “the 1st person followed by performative verb” is applied. For example, the moderator’s utterance “I will ask the host ..., we will perform...,etc.” in the topic of *KekerasandanPremanMengancam Kita* (Violence and *Preman* Threaten Us),was said at the same time of his acts walking to the person being called as ’the host’. The moderator greeted the whole audience together and presented his intention to ask ’the host’, the vice governor of East Java (Saifullah Yusuf).

D. Context: O1 is moderator (KarniIlyas); O2 is the vice Governor of East Java (Mr. Saifullah Yusuf), both the moderator and the addressee have ever been close friends; the topic is about “violence threatened us”, and the situation is informal.

Karni: *Pemirsamasihbersama Indonesia Lawyers Club, sekarangsayamaumengunjungituanrumah, Gubernur, wakilGubernurJawaTimurbapakSaifullah Yusuf atau yang popular meskipunbeliauinisatubenderadulusamasayadulu. Memilihjalan yang salahjadilahGubernur. ((audiencetertawa))   Gus Ipulbagaimanaandasebagaipemerintahdaerahmelihatfenomenaini.Bagibanyakmasyarakatiniu*

> *dahmencekam.Ditambahkansekarangkekerasanitusudah*   yang   dikhawatirkan   yang
> *terjadilebihparahlagidari*   *yang*
> *sekarang.BagaimanaJawatimurmelihatinidanbagaimanaantisipasinya.*

Karni: 'Audience, you are still with Indonesia Lawyers Club, ...(1) <u>now I want to ask to the Governor, the vice Governor of East Java, Mr. Saifullah Yusuf who is so well-konwn although he formerly was in the same group of me'</u>. Now he chose 'the wrong career as the governor' ((all are laughing)). *Gus*Ipul, you are as the district leader, How do you think of this phenomena? For the public, such a case is frightening. Nowadays, the frightening violence has occurred more than current events. How is the leader of East of Java views the case and give its solution?'

Saifullah: *Terimakasih mas Karni, ((Karnimenyela: "Karni")).*

> *: O yapakKarniIlyas, mohonmaaf. Sama-samadibredeldulupak ((tertawa)).Pak KarniIlyas, sayasebenernyaolehpakGubernurdiperintahuntuklebihbanyakmendengardan   yang keduamengucapkanterimakasih, akhirnya Indonesia Lawyers Club diselenggarakan di JawaTimur ((audience tepuktangan)). Yang kedua, sayameneruskansedikitpak yang tadibahwapolisikanmemangjumlahjauhdaripada   ideal. Makaperlubantuandarisemuapihakuntukbisamelaksanakantugasdenganbaik.Itujugadialamiole hpropinsi-propinsi di seluruh Indonesia termasuk di JawaTimur... .*

Saifullah: 'Thank you *Mas*karni ((interuptingKarni: just called me Karni)).

> ' Oh, yes Mr. Karni, I'm so sorry. Similarly being censored ((laughing)). Mr. Karni, actually, I was instructed by the governor to listen longer and to say thanks, that ILC has been held in the East Java ((audience applause)). Second, (2) <u>I continue that the number of policemen is far from being ideal.</u> So, we need more assistants from several people to run the duty well. That phenomenonhas also been experienced by other provinces throughout Indonesia, including the East Java....'   (Data: KPMK/29 Feb 12/Pej).

The underlined utterances (1) and (2) above use a declarative speech strategy. The moderator's (1) and the addressee's utterance (2) respectively implied to make a change of situation, from the situation of pause in the discussion, after greeting audience to the situation of starting the process of questioning, and of starting to continue giving clarification. The moderator did this (1) by signaling to approach the addressee (Mr. Saifullah), while the addressee's, by signaling with stressing tone. The moderator tried to change the situation being appropriate to what he had currently spoken, i.e.,"I want to come closer (*mengunjungi*)..." by approaching the addressee. In the meantime, the addressee has tried to be impressible to the audience by the stressing tone in elaborating the fact of very few numbers of police as compared to their role and responsibility.

4. Conclusion

From the description above, the writer can draw the following conclusions. Firstly, the moderators' speech strategies used in tvOne ILC discussion are mostly influenced by the relation of the moderator and the social status of the participants: lawyers, state officials, people representatives, common people, victims, experts, and students_ participating in the discussion. The theory of speech act strategies (Searle, 1979) combined to non-observance maxim of cooperation principles (Grice, 1975), have significantly been applied to institutional discourse such as discourse of information elicitation.

The results have shown that the average use of moderators' speech strategy to the intended lawyers, common people or victims is using directly literal, with the variants of: repeating the addressee's words, pointing directly to the intended S, and making counter of the addressee's utterance. The moderator's choice of directly literal speech strategy towards the addressees mentioned above is due to his having background knowledge especially in law enforcement during his experience to be a criminal journalist. The backgrounds have led and aroused his empathy towards common people or victims. Related to such speech strategy, the addressees also feel at ease in giving objective and fair response to the moderator by focusing on clarification and objective facts.

Secondly, the average use of moderators' indirectly non-literal speech strategy with a specific metaphor is used to consider the addressee's higher status, in which this functions to criticize or to

give respect to the authorities or representative and experts or observers. This is implied that they are assumed as public figure and even have higher status than the moderator, so that the moderator thinks contextually to keep their face in front of the audience. When there is a joke, the moderator's way of presenting it is only to mean good maintenance and to break the tension of the higher status addressees. Finally, a specific performativemoderators' speech strategy is also used in a very few chance as this occurred when the moderator has greeted the audience and has intention to change the audience's worlds during introduction in every discussion session.

Various moderator speech strategies discussed above are useful to reveal information such as the clients' objectivityof certain cases and the lawyers' right duty during guiding their client. The success of moderator in revealing the information within ILC discussion is also useful as a form socializing the matter of law into the life of common people.

References

[1]   Searle, John R. "A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts" dalam A.P. Martinich (ed.). 1996. *The Philosophy of Language*. New York dan Oxford: OUP. 1979.

[2]   Grice, H.P. "Logic and Conversation", in P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 3*: Speech Acts, pp. 41-58. New York: Academic press. Reprinted in Grice 1989: 22-57. 1975.

[3]   Macauly, Marcia. "Tough Talk: Indirectness and Gender in Request for Information". *Journal of Pragmatics* 33 (2001) 293-316. www.elsevier. nl/locate/pragma. 2001.

[4]   Hess-Lüttich."(Pseudo-) Argumentation in TV-debates". *Journal of Prag-matics* 39 (2007) 1360-1370 http://www.elsevier.com/locate/pragma. 2007.

[5]   Purnanto, Dwi. *Struktur, Fungsi, dan Penafsiran Makna Pemakaian Bahasa dalam Proses Persidangan Pidana: Studi Kasus di Pengadilan Wilayah Surakarta.*Disertasi.UNS. 2009.

[6]   Clayman, E Steven. "Address Terms in the Service of Other Actions: the Case of News Interview Talk" in *Discourse & Communication* 4(2) 161-183. http://dcm.sagepub.com 2010.

[7]   Amaliah, Farhanah . "Strategi Bertutur Pemandu Acara dan Narasumber: Sebuah Analisis Kesantunan Berbahasa dalam Program Dialog *Suara Anda* Metro". Skripsi Universitas Indonesia (Tidak Dipublikasikan). 2011.

[8]   Rosnilawati, Ermanto, danNoviaJuita. "Tindak Tutur dan strategi Bertutur dalam *Pasambahan Maantan Marapulai* Pesta Perkawinan di Alahan Panjang Kabupaten Solok". Skripsi FBS Universitas Negeri Padang (Tidak Diterbitkan). 2013.

[9]   Wulandari, L. Ayu. "Strategi Retorika Pembawa Acara dalam *Indonesia Lawyers Club* di TV ONE". Skripsi Universitas Jember (Tidak Diterbitkan). 2013.

[10] Coulthard, Malcolm. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. New York: Longman Group Limited. 1985.

[11] Thomas, Jenny. *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman. 1995.

[12] Wijana, I DewaPutu, .*Dasar-dasarPragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset. 1996.

[13] Archer, Dawn. Karin Aijmer. and Anne Wichmann. *Pragmatics: An Advanced Resource Book for Students.* London & New York: Routledge. 2012.

[14] Cutting, Joan. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Routledge. 2008.

[15] Coulthard, *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge. 1992.

[16] Luft, J and Ingham H. *The Johari Window: a Graphic Model for Inter personal Relations.*(http://www.businessballs.com/ johariwindow model. htm.(05/01/2012   at 12.04). 1955.

[17] Ilyas, Karni. *40 Tahun Jadi Wartawan, Karni Ilyas: Lahir untuk Berita.* Kompas: Fenty Effendy. 2012.

[18] Sinclair and Coulthard. Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils. London: Oxford University Press. 1975.

[19] Tarone, Elaine. *Some Thoughts on the Notion of Moderators's speech strategy.* TESOL QUARTELY, Vol. 15. No. 3. September 1981. 1981.