

**THE USE OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS AND THE
OBSERVANCE OF GRICE'S PRINCIPLES IN POLITICAL
INTERVIEWS**

NIK NUR LAILA BT NIK MUSTAPHA

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

2017

**THE USE OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS AND THE
OBSERVANCE OF GRICE'S PRINCIPLES IN
POLITICAL INTERVIEWS**

NIK NUR LAILA BT NIK MUSTAPHA

**DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND
LANGUAGE**

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

2017

UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION

Name of Candidate: Nik Nur Laila Bt Nik Mustapha

(I.C/Passport No:

Matric No: TGB 120075

Name of Degree: Master of English as a Second Language

Title of Project Paper/Research Report/Dissertation/Thesis ("this Work"):

The Use of Personal Pronouns and the Observance of Grice's Principles in Political Interviews

Field of Study: Discourse Analysis

I do solemnly and sincerely declare that:

- (1) I am the sole author/writer of this Work;
- (2) This Work is original;
- (3) Any use of any work in which copyright exists was done by way of fair dealing and for permitted purposes and any excerpt or extract from, or reference to or reproduction of any copyright work has been disclosed expressly and sufficiently and the title of the Work and its authorship have been acknowledged in this Work;
- (4) I do not have any actual knowledge nor do I ought reasonably to know that the making of this work constitutes an infringement of any copyright work;
- (5) I hereby assign all and every rights in the copyright to this Work to the University of Malaya ("UM"), who henceforth shall be owner of the copyright in this Work and that any reproduction or use in any form or by any means whatsoever is prohibited without the written consent of UM having been first had and obtained;
- (6) I am fully aware that if in the course of making this Work I have infringed any copyright whether intentionally or otherwise, I may be subject to legal action or any other action as may be determined by UM.

Candidate's Signature

Date:

Subscribed and solemnly declared before,

Witness's Signature

Date:

Name:

Designation:

ABSTRACT

The current study examined the discourse of the current Prime Minister of Malaysia, Dato' Seri Najib Razak (DSNR) and the current Leader of Opposition Malaysia; Parti Keadilan Rakyat, Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim (DSAI), with a view to investigate their strategic use of personal pronouns *I* and *We* and their adherence to Grice's Cooperative Principles (1975) in political interviews. The analysis of this study will help shed some light on how the two politicians employ the strategies of using personal pronouns to generate implicature which can affect the overall outcome of the interviews, especially the audience's understanding and acceptance of the message. Additionally, the study will also help to give a complete picture of what the two politicians are conveying in the political interviews and explain the ways these politicians conform to Grice's Cooperative Principles when they were asked questions on any politically related issues.

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini mengkaji wacana Perdana Menteri Malaysia, Dato' Seri Najib Razak (DSNR) dan Ketua Pemimpin Pembangkang Malaysia; Parti Keadilan Rakyat, Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim (DSAI), dengan objektif untuk merungkai strategi penggunaan ganti nama diri *Saya* dan *Kami*, dan juga menganalisis temu bual politik dari perspektif pragmatik berdasarkan teori yang dibangunkan oleh Paul Grice iaitu Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) dalam wawancara politik. Analisis kajian ini membantu menjelaskan mengenai bagaimana ahli-ahli politik ini mengatur strategi dalam penggunaan kata ganti nama diri untuk membantu mereka dalam menghasilkan implikatur pragmatik yang ternyata boleh memberi kesan kepada hasil keseluruhan temu bual, terutamanya dari segi pemahaman dan penerimaan mesej dalam kalangan penonton. Selain itu, kajian ini juga membantu untuk memberi gambaran lengkap mengenai apa yang ingin disampaikan oleh ahli-ahli politik ini melalui penggunaan kata ganti nama dalam temu bual politik tersebut. Pada masa yang sama, kajian ini juga membantu untuk menerangkan bagaimana ahli-ahli politik mematuhi Maksim Perbualan, iaitu teori yang telah dibangunkan oleh Grice (1975) apabila mereka diwawancara mengenai isu-isu berkaitan politik .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I offer my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Ruth Ong Lok Tik, who has supported me throughout completing my dissertation with her patience and knowledge, and at the same time allowing me to work independently. I attribute the level of my Master's Degree to her encouragement and effort. Honestly, this research would not have been completed or written without her full guidance and support. One could not wish for a better and supportive supervisor like she is.

I would like to thank the experts/panels who were involved in the Proposal Defense and Candidature Defense of this dissertation: Dr. Thilagavathi a/p Shanmuganathan and Dr. Soh Bee Kwee. Without their passionate participation and input, this dissertation could not have been successfully completed.

I would take this opportunity to express my deepest gratitude to my parents, for their endless support and for being a great source of foundation and encouragement. Thank you for believing in me and praying for my best in everything I do. Not to forget, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my siblings, without them by my side through good and bad times, I would not have completed this dissertation. Thanks again for the wonderful and sincere prayers that they have blessed me with.

Same goes to all my beloved lecturers of Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, who have given me so much to remember. Their knowledge has been useful throughout completing this dissertation. I would like to thank my friends who have been on the same journey with me for their endless support. Lastly, to every person that gave me something to light my pathway, I thank them for believing in me. Alhamdulillah, praise to Allah.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
<i>Abstrak</i>	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi-viii
List of Definition of Terms	ix
List of Tables.....	x
List of Symbols and Abbreviations.....	xi
List of Appendices	xii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1-9
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background of Study	1-3
1.1.1 Political scenario in Malaysia.....	1-2
1.1.2 Malaysia's 13 th General Election	3
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	3-6
1.3 Research Objectives.....	6
1.4 Research Questions.....	6
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	7-8
1.6 Limitations	8
1.7 Summary of Chapter One	9
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10-29
2.0 Introduction.....	10
2.1 Discourse Analysis	10
2.2 Discourse Analysis in Pragmatics	11-13

2.3	Discourse Analysis in Political Language and Political Interviews	13-14
2.4	Political Interviews	14-15
2.5	The Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Contexts	16-24
2.6	The Realization of Grice's Cooperative Principles in Political Interviews	24-28
2.7	Summary of Chapter Two	29

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY30-45

3.0	Introduction.....	30
3.1	Research Design	30-31
3.2	Research Framework	31-37
3.3	Data	37-40
3.3.1	Selection of Data	37
3.3.2	Selection of Subject	37-40
3.4	Research Procedures	40-42
3.5	Reliability	42-43
3.6	Research Analysis.....	43-44
3.7	Summary of Chapter Three	45

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS46-154

4.0	Introduction.....	46-48
4.1	Analysis	49
4.1.1	Theme: Political Affairs	50-90
4.1.2	Theme: Governance	91-123
4.1.3	Theme: Political Party Affairs.....	124-137
4.1.4	Theme: Foreign Affairs	138-145
4.1.5	Theme: Presidential Legacy	146-149
4.1.6	Theme: Personal Issues	150-153

4.2	Summary of Chapter Four	154
-----	-------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS155-186

5.0	Introduction	155
5.1	Comparison in the use of Personal Pronouns <i>I</i> and <i>we</i>	156
5.1.1	Occurrences of the use of Personal Pronoun <i>I</i>	156-161
5.1.2	The purpose for the use of Personal Pronoun <i>I</i>	162-163
5.1.3	Occurrences of the use of Personal Pronoun <i>we</i>	163-166
5.1.4	Contributing factors to the high and low use of audience-exclusive <i>we</i> , audience-inclusive <i>we</i> and generic <i>we</i>	167-169
5.2	Grice's Cooperative Principles Analysis	170-182
5.3	Conclusion	183-185
5.4	Suggestions for future work.....	186
	References	187-191
	Appendices	192-215

LIST OF DEFINITION OF TERMS

- i. Discourse Analysis – How language is used in social contexts to achieve particular goals (Halliday, 1985)
- ii. Grice's Cooperative Principles/Grice Conversational Maxims - A principle of conversation proposed by Grice in 1975, stating that participants expect that each will make a “conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange” (Yule, 1996)
- iii. Participation Framework – A means of analysing the various interactional roles played by different people in a group in a particular place. When someone makes a contribution to a spoken encounter, there is not simply a speaker and hearer, but a 'circle' in which each individual holds a particular participation status. Whenever a participant makes an utterance, the other participants will all have some sort of participation status in relation to it (Goffman, 1981)
- iv. Concept of Footing – “The alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance” (Goffman, 1981)

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.6	: The Conversational Maxims (Grice, 1975)	25
Table 3.2	: The Explanation and Examples of Grice's Conversational Maxims ..	34-35
Table 3.3.2	: Information on the Political Interviews	39-40
Table 4.0	: Transcription Notations (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984)	47-48
Table 4.1	: Categorisations of Extracts According to Theme	49
Table 5.1.1	: The average use of Personal Pronoun <i>I</i>	157
Table 5.1.2	: Discourse functions of the use of Personal Pronoun <i>I</i>	157-158
Table 5.1.3	: The average use of Personal Pronoun <i>We</i>	164
Table 5.1.4	: Discourse functions of the use of Personal Pronoun <i>We</i>	165
Table 5.2	: The observance and flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles ...	170-171
Table 5.3	: Overall Findings for DSNR's Interviews	180
Table 5.4	: Overall Findings for DSAI's Interviews.....	181

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

NR	:	Najib Razak
DSNR	:	Dato' Seri Najib Razak
AI	:	Anwar Ibrahim
DSAI	:	Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim
VP	:	Veronica Pedrosa
FI	:	Faridah Ibrahim
JA	:	Julian Assange
RC	:	Ricky Carandang
PR	:	People's Alliance (Pakatan Rakyat)
PAS	:	Malaysian Islamic Party (Parti Se-Islam Malaysia)
BN	:	National Front (Barisan Nasional)

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Interview Transcripts.....	192
Appendix B: Notational Conventions (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984).....	214

University of Malaya

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Political interviews have always been a very important part of politics as it is meant to be one of the ways for politicians to communicate with the public, in which they are able to convey necessary information especially about their policies, ideologies and values through a series of questions and answer sessions with the journalists. The Internet and television have certainly made it easier for people to watch political interviews as political issues are mediated via these sources especially the Internet. According to Bull (2002), it is a major political asset for politicians to appear good on television because they are seen and heard close-up, and in fact, all of their actions become public attention. However, what is most important is what the politicians say and mean in the interviews. The language that is used in political contexts has to be examined in order to derive from it the essence of the message that the speaker wishes to convey. The political contexts too, need to be understood as they vary from culture to culture. The next section therefore describes the political system and situation in Malaysia, the context in which the current study is based.

1.1 Background of Study

1.1.1 Political scenario in Malaysia

The political system in Malaysia is based on a federal parliamentary monarchy. Malaysia adopted the Westminster parliamentary system, the British colonial legacy, in its political system. The ruling party is the National Front or known as Barisan Nasional (BN), which is the coalition of United Malays National Organization (UMNO) and 13 other ethnically-based parties, and considered as the longest continuing ruling party in Malaysia since independence in 1957 until now, 2016. However in the 2008 general

election, BN lost more than one-third of the parliamentary seats to People's Alliance party or Pakatan Rakyat (PR), a loose alliance of the opposition parties, for the first time in history. This marked BN's first failure to secure a two-thirds supermajority in Parliament since 1969. Najib Razak was elected as the leader of UMNO on March 26th, 2009, and he swore in as the Prime Minister of Malaysia on April 3rd, 2009. However, BN's failure recurred in the 2013 general election with BN's worst ever election result where they only won 47.38%. PR won 50.8% in the parliamentary contests, while the remaining seats were taken by independent contestants.

In the opposition, PR which is a Malaysian political coalition that controls three state governments had lost to BN. PR comprises the People's Justice Party or also known as Parti Keadilan Rakyat (PKR), Democratic Action Party (DAP), and Pan-Malaysian Islamic Party or known as Parti Islam Se-Malaysia (PAS), formed after the 12th Malaysian general election in 2008. PR is managed and led by all constituent parties with no official leader. Each of the political parties has their own ideology; PKR promotes social justice and anti-corruption, PAS aims to form Malaysia as an Islamic nation based on Islamic legal theory, whereas DAP has secular, multiracial and social democratic ideals. Anwar Ibrahim formed the reformation movement and led the opposition party immediately after he was dismissed as the Deputy Prime Minister. However, Anwar Ibrahim was then sent to prison for a sodomy charge that was brought against him, and eventually returned to Parliament as the leader of the Malaysian opposition after he won the re-election in the Permatang Pauh by-election on August 26th, 2008.

1.1.2 Malaysia's 13th General Election

This study particularly focuses on the context of the pre-election of Malaysia's 13th General Election (GE 13) which was held on May 5th, 2013. GE 13 was the first general election in which Najib Razak led BN after he took over from Abdullah Ahmad Badawi in 2009. In GE 12, the combined opposition which consisted of DAP, PKR and PAS to form PR had won 82 seats out of 222 seats in the Parliament. PR denied BN a two-thirds majority and they won control over five states government out of thirteen which are Kedah, Penang, Selangor, Perak and Kelantan. In addition, the PR party also won 10 out of 11 parliamentary seats in Kuala Lumpur. This issue raised many worries among BN and its allies as it could be the starting point for PR to challenge BN's potential to win in GE 13.

Since this sub-section has presented the background of the political parties in Malaysia, as well as the background of Malaysia's 13th General Election, the following sub-section will present the statement of the problem for this current study.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Politicians often highlight their achievements and mention less about their failures. According to Boskin (2016), political leaders take credit for what worked and blame political opponents for what failed. In order to do so, they tend to avoid answering questions that are controversial as a way to protect their positive image and to hide certain things that they refuse to discuss. It is common to hear politicians claim that education will be a priority in their administration, or that they are concerned about the nations' cost of living. However, these vague claims might give us the impression that politicians care about the same things we care about, but in reality anybody can make this kind of statement without any fear of being caught in a lie. The questions that one might ask are, to what extent are these remarks about politicians true? If so, how is

it possible for them to dodge questions that are related to their controversial issues? Is there any method or strategy that they use in order to disengage themselves from the situation?

In Malaysia, people are dealing with some tough economic challenges which have resulted in endless arguments, for instance, on the issue of the increasing of oil prices and the dropping value of Malaysian Ringgit. Malaysians of different political views spend a lot of time hurling abuses over one another, questioning the rationale of every action taken by the government and demanding for clear justifications from the ministers and political leaders. This can be seen from the demonstrations and rallies held by both sides of the parties which are the Bersih rally from the opposition side; and the Red Shirts rally from the government side, which enable Malaysians to express their disapproval or to show their support toward the current political system. This proves that there is a growing sense of awareness among Malaysians on their political freedom. Hence, this study is conducted to investigate the discourse of two prominent leaders in Malaysia through their use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*, and the findings will help inform the readers on how the use of these pronouns assist politicians to accomplish or flout the maxim of Grice's Cooperative Principles in political interviews which have helped them to escape from responding to certain questions. Moreover, politicians often abuse language especially when they need to convince the public while presenting their ideologies or views in order to make people believe only what they want them to believe by continually highlighting their strengths and focusing on the opponent's weaknesses. To what extent is this true? Orwell (1968) argues that politicians are abusing language by distorting facts and deceiving listeners with their word choices.

The language used in a political interview acts as a medium for transmitting political information to the overhearing audience and it helps politicians to accomplish certain communicative goals. One of the ways to achieve their goals is via the use of

personal pronouns (Bramley, 2001). For instance, Nanda Anggarani Putri and Eri Kurniawan (2015) claims that person deixis plays a very important role as it can be used to represent the speaker's identity through the way the speaker refers to himself, his opponent, as well as his audience. Since the selection of personal pronouns helps to add meaning to a sentence, this has also become a problem because pronouns often carry very strong messages about who we are and how we see the world. Most importantly, the pronominal choice used by politicians also has implications, for instance: Are *you* a part of *us*?; Does *we* include *me*? and to whom does *you*, *us*, *we* and *me* specifically refer to remain ambiguous, especially for the audience of the interviews. For instance, the use of the first person singular pronoun *I* declares who is responsible while using the first person plural pronoun *we* can have the purpose of making the status of responsibility ambiguous (David, 2014). The current study will analyse the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*, and how the use of these pronouns assist Dato' Seri Najib Razak (DSNR) and Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim (DSAI) to accomplish or flout the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles in the context of political interviews.

When people listen to political interviews, they listen with pre-existing biases; consequently judging the politicians according to the party they belong to possibly because they have different levels of understanding about politics. People with a high level of understanding may clearly understand a politician's stand by what the politician presented unlike those with lower level of understanding about politics. In most interview settings, the interviewer sets the topic or asks the questions while the interviewee responds to those questions. The combination of studying both the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* and the observance of conversational maxims in the current study will help to interpret what the two politicians are conveying in the political interviews. Therefore, this study is conducted to address these problems as it could help provide the readers with reliable information in order for them to make a better

judgement about each political party rather than relying on a single source that may be inaccurate or biased.

The research objectives and research questions for this study are presented in the next sub-section.

1.3 Research Objectives

The current study examines the discourse of two political figures in political interviews they granted. One is the current Prime Minister of Malaysia, Dato' Seri Najib Tun Razak (DSNR) and the other is the current Leader of the opposition known as Parti Keadilan Rakyat, Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim (DSAI) with a view to investigate how their use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* assist them to accomplish or flout the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles (1975) in political interviews. The research objectives, therefore, are:

1. To examine the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* by two Malaysian prominent leaders and the possible reasons behind their use in political interviews.
2. To investigate the ways in which the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* assist in the accomplishment or flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles by the two Malaysian prominent leaders in political interviews.

1.4 Research Questions

1. How do two prominent Malaysian politicians use the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in political interviews and what are the possible reasons behind such use?
2. How does the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* assist the two prominent Malaysian politicians to accomplish or flout Grice's Cooperative Principles in political interviews?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study will contribute to the body of knowledge of the nature of political discourse and benefit the audiences of political interviews especially in Malaysia which consist of three main ethnic groups; the Malays, Chinese and Indians, and the indigenous groups in Sabah and Sarawak, as well as interested parties outside Malaysia who follow the political situations in Malaysia closely.

The major challenge in Malaysia's politics is often at keeping the balance between the main ethnic groups in terms of providing equal distribution of national wealth which has frequently resulted in political debates in the state. Events in the past have proven that it is important that the people are taught to understand the political system and the history of the country, as well as being encouraged to vote and have their say. Without the basic knowledge about politics, there is a huge danger of the future generation being disengaged and as a result, they are not able to make informed decisions when they are old enough to vote and elect the best leader to run the country. Therefore, the findings of this study will give the readers the opportunity to discover their own political beliefs and see in much greater details the benefits and disadvantages of the wide range of political ideologies demonstrated by the two prominent leaders, which were mainly manifested in their discourse in the political interviews.

The findings will help the readers, particularly the different groups of Malaysians to realize that as citizens of Malaysia, they have the rights and freedom to choose the leaders of the government and they should take advantage of the opportunity that they have as Malaysians to vote for a competent leader. If people do not understand politics, and do not know their leaders well and the ideologies they believe in, they can easily be manipulated. It is important to note that the political ideologies of the ruling party will become the law and if people end up voting for a political party without

knowing the ideologies that the party is committed to, they may end up living in a country which laws are against their interest.

Apart from that, the readers might not have thought that a small linguistic unit; such as the personal pronouns, is significant in the analyses of political interviews as such that it will assist the readers to critically evaluate politicians' responses the next time they make other public appearances in political campaigns. If previously the readers are only familiar with the term 'avoidance' and the clichés about politicians who often avoid certain questions, this study helps them to understand the term 'flout', and the notion of footing, recognize how the 'flouting' of conversational maxims occurs, which are actually a part of the strategies of avoidance employed by politicians, that is often manifested through their utterances. Besides that, the findings of this study will also benefit second language learners to venture into doing a research in the area of discourse analysis, pragmatics and examine other aspects of linguistic strategies that are evident in political discourses.

1.6 Limitations

This study focuses only on the pre-election political interviews of Malaysia's 13th General Election which discuss the current issues in Malaysia and therefore, the findings could not be generalized to political situations in other countries because of the differences in socio-political environments. Instead of looking at the leaders of each party, this study particularly observes two politicians; one is the leader of the pro-government, and the other is the leader of the opposition. Last but not least, no other linguistics cues are taken into considerations, for instance, the politicians' gestures, facial expressions, dialect and style of communication.

1.7 Summary of Chapter One

In this chapter, the background of the Malaysian political parties that took part in the 13th General Election is introduced. In addition, the research objectives, as well as the limitations and the significance of the current study are also presented. The next chapter reviews previous studies that have been made in the area of discourse analysis which focuses on political contexts. This information is important as it helps to inform the readers of this current study, to understand the scenario of the two political figures' performance in the interviews.

University of Malaysia

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

In this chapter, some of the previous studies made in the area of discourse analysis, adopting different approaches to analyse the use of the personal pronouns and the flouting of Grice's conversational maxims particularly in political context are presented and discussed. The concept and definition of discourse analysis that the current study is based on is explained.

2.1 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is a series of interdisciplinary approaches which can be used to explore different social domains in different types of studies (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). In most cases, the general idea of discourse analysis is usually defined as the analysis of language 'beyond the sentence'. However, different perspectives offer different suggestions as to what 'discourse analysis' means since there is no clear consensus that offers the best explanation and clarification on what discourses are, and whether there is a specific way to analyse them. Fairclough (as cited in Paltridge, 2012, p. 6) claims that there are a number of different views of discourse analysis among scholars and often times they take up the term of their own, and sometimes in different ways. This study follows the definition of discourse analysis by Halliday (1985) in which it is seen as paying attention to how language is used in social contexts to achieve particular goals.

2.2 Discourse Analysis in Pragmatics

Pragmatics, as a study of utterance meaning or meaning in context, is concerned with discourse. Since pragmatics provides an alternative approach to discourse analysis, it offers the possibility of explaining discourse facts from a linguistic point of view. The pragmatic approach has been used in analysing text in order to clearly understand what a speaker is trying to say. Several studies have emphasized the pragmatic perspectives, for instance by adopting the Grice's Cooperative Principles theory as the framework. According to Alfayez (2007), Grice's theory of pragmatics provides a clear description of the pragmatic conditions which allow for the interpretations of different referring terms. Levinson (as cited in Vizcaino Ortega, 2006, p. 407) defines pragmatics as the study of implicature, presupposition, speech acts, various aspects of discourse structure, as well as deixis. Levinson viewed deixis as the clearest way to show the relationship between language and context. Deixis refers to a word or phrase that indicates the time, a place or a situation in which the speaker is speaking. Jena (2012) claims that deixis is often expressed through demonstratives, tense or personal pronouns.

Despite many studies that have been made in the use of the personal pronouns in political contexts, it is interesting to see that pronominal choice has been empirically and theoretically researched from a variety of perspectives such as of those in various positions of power, not only in politics, which revealed that pronominal choice of a speaker plays an important role in a discourse. This idea is supported by Benveniste (as cited in De Fina, 1995, p. 380) who described personal pronouns as empty signs that only become full when used in actual discourse. He further added that pronouns provide the instrument of a conversion that one could call the conversion of language into a discourse. Thus, it leaves a door of an obscure understanding for readers to understand the roles of pronominal choice in a discourse.

Taguchi and Sykes's (2013) study claimed that the use of the personal pronouns allows a speaker to self-position themselves when they want to strategically pass pragmatic functions, for instance, when they are expressing solidarity with the readers, taking a position or stand, stating opinions, or creating distance between author and text. Urzua (as cited in Taguchi & Sykes, 2013) investigated pronominal choice and self-positioning strategies in the second language academic writing by analysing 38 essays generated by two groups of second language learners in ESL/EAP program of a university. The findings revealed that important shifts in pronominal choice take place as learners move from one course to the next as they attempt to establish a textual presence appropriate to the stylistic goals of their essays.

In a recent study, Saj (2012) explored pronominal choices in one of the Oprah Winfrey shows, where Oprah is hosting Queen Rania of Jordan. Using critical discourse analysis approach, Saj analysed the transcripts of the episode to find out on the pronominal choice by Oprah throughout the whole show with her guest, Queen Rania of Jordan. The results of this study revealed that the use of personal pronouns allows Oprah Winfrey to represent her and others better as she speaks, thus, proving that the choice of pronouns is one of the main factors that had helped her to maintain a good interchange with her audiences. Besides that, the study also showed that Oprah frequently uses the personal pronoun *I*, and based on the results, the use of the personal pronoun *I* by Oprah is mainly when she wants to describe specific deeds, such as when she reminisces her previous life as a poor Negro child who now is living a better life; when she wants to state her personal view about the topic being discussed, such as when she talks about her background knowledge of an issue which does not refer to all audiences as a whole; and when she wants to present her personal beliefs and comments on any of the issues discussed throughout the show, such as when she expresses her beliefs in educating girls.

In another study, Okamura (2009) examined how a speaker employed the personal pronouns *I*, *you* and *we* in an academic speech but with special attention to the use of the personal pronoun *you* via the analysis of Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE). Two speech events were chosen from MICASE i.e. the undergraduate lectures and public lectures. Okamura had chosen the speeches based on two linguistic criteria; the words before and after the pronoun. The findings of the study revealed that the words before pronouns show that the word “if” often goes with *you* compared to *we* and *I* in both lectures. Hence, making “if *you* were/are” the most frequent pattern in undergraduate lectures.

Since the focus of this study is on political interviews, the nature and setting that take place in the discourse of a political interview are further discussed in the next sub-section.

2.3 Discourse Analysis in Political Language and Political Interviews

The language in political discourse is primarily focused on convincing and persuading people to take specific political actions or decisions. According to Bev (2008), sometimes politicians use language for unnecessary reasons as it is one of the powerful tools in the political field. Politics and language are ultimately dependent upon one another as it allows politicians to carefully choose their words in order for them to not just convince or persuade people, but also to self-express themselves in front of their audience. Atkinson (as cited in David, 2014, p.165) argued that one of the influential instruments of political discourse is linguistic manipulation, and claimed that linguistic manipulation is a political strategy that is based on the idea of persuading people to take political actions or convinces them to support a party or an individual.

In present time, politics essentially dominates the mass media, and it leads to various new forms of linguistic manipulation, for instance, updated texts in slogans.

Indirect manipulation of language allows speakers to influence presumptions, views, ambitions and fears of the public to the degree of making people take false statements as true claims or at a point making them support policies that are incompatible with their interests according to Thomans and Wareing (as cited in David, 2014, p.164). In addition, there are a number of studies conducted that deal with politics using various linguistic approaches, and one of the approaches is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) which incorporates the study of discourse that views language as a form of social practice.

In another study by David (2010), on the construction of group identities in the leadership discourse of Tun Dr. Mahathir Mohamed (TDM), found that most of TDM's speeches highlighted his concerns regarding equality and unity among Malaysians using CDA as an approach. Similarly, Azimah Shurfa Mohammed Shukry (2013) explored the discursive strategies employed by TDM in his speeches which showed a reluctance to accept Bush's military ideology of "War on Terror". One of the findings revealed how his speech mostly comprises the call for human rights, freedom and justice.

In order to lay the groundwork for understanding the approach of discourse analysis specifically in the use of personal pronouns in political contexts, the previous studies done in the area of discourse analysis are further discussed in subsequent sections in this chapter.

2.4 Political Interviews

Interviews function as a platform to gain one-on-one interaction. Although there are various types of interviews, all types of interviews share the same common features: they include the discourse practice of questioning and answering, and characterize the same role distribution – an interviewer and an interviewee. Political interviews have specific communication goals, however, the main goal is to persuade and influence the

public, and it is usually accomplished through conventionalized ways. Wilson (as cited in Tarrosy, 2015, p.39) states that politicians use words and sentences in an emotive manner as a strategy to build solidarity, to express different kinds of emotions, for instance, fear, hate or joy. This is further supported by Chilton (2004), which claims that the doings of politicians will not exist without the use of language.

Political interviews usually take place in an institutional setting, for instance, a TV or radio station to a mass audience, including the elected officials, political candidates, as well as the public who are also potential voters. Often times when responding to questions, public figures will either give a straightforward answer, or they will attempt to avoid giving any response. Politicians will use various linguistic means to show involvement, to express their opinions as well as to present their standpoints in order to influence and convince their potential voters. They will strive to present themselves positively in front of their audience, because whatever they say will be broadcasted to a mass audience, which will not only involve the public but also the elected officials, political candidates and others, therefore, making the way they answer questions is of great consequence (Clayman, 1993).

In political interviews, the interviewer is usually a professional journalist and the interviewee is a politician representing his party. The interviewer will be responsible for controlling the dialogue, asking questions that are challenging in order to gain and reveal important information from the interviewee. Bull (2009) distinguished three types of responses to a question demonstrated by politicians in political interviews, i.e., a reply that is not explicitly stated, a reply that only answers a part of the questions and a reply that is interrupted by the interviewer, in which it is unsure to be regarded as an answer or not.

2. 5 The Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Contexts

Personal pronouns are strategically used to achieve and affect desired outcomes, especially in political speeches, debates or interviews in many of the previous studies (see Bull & Fetzer 2006; De Fina 1995; Kuo 2002) along with other related studies in pronominal choice (see Saj 2012; Okamura 2009). Since political interviews or speeches are usually watched by majority of the voting public via the mass media, it is the best time for politicians to carefully choose their pronoun choice in their speech or utterances as it will reflect their thinking and attitude regarding any political issues and political identities Maitland & Wilson (as cited in Nakaggwe, 2012). It is one way for politicians to present the positive aspects of themselves to the public. The personal pronouns are chosen because they can be used to refer to themselves as well as to others in many different ways.

Bull and Fetzer (2006) studied how politicians strategically made use of pronominal shifts as a form of equivocation in political interviews by analysing 21 televised political interviews broadcasted during the British general elections between the year 1997 and 2001 just before the war with Iraq in 2003. Bull and Fetzer analysed the televised interviews following the theory of equivocation by Bavelas et. al. (1990), and Goffman's (1981) concept of footing. Goffman (1981) explains footing as "the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance", for instance, a speaker that is enrolling in a talk may shift roles simultaneously as he/she speaks, for instance, in a political interview, the interviewee may project himself holding the role of a Prime Minister of a country, to the role of a member of a political party he/she belongs to, to the role of a nation of the country he/she belongs to in response to the questions they received as they are engaging in the conversation. This shift of footing may also be signaled through prosodic or paralinguistic features such as pauses, intonation, gestures

and so forth, however, according to Goffman (1981) the change of footing can also be signaled through pronominal shifts. The findings of the study showed that pronominal shifts were used by politicians as a means of over-inclusion and under-inclusion. Over-inclusion can be used to intensify arguments and allows speakers to equivocate, for instance, when Charles Kennedy (CK) is asked by an interviewer: “How *you* as the party leader would tackle that problem of racial attacks on asylum seekers if *you* could?” in his reply, CK says:

“Well, what *we’re* saying is that if *you* have a national directorate, and a much more coordinated approach than *we* have at the moment, that will help to identify. Then *you* need to work with the local authorities over dispersal policy. And what *you* do not need to do, and this is almost as important, this is where Jonathan interrupted a little bit earlier, the point I was making is *you* won’t solve the problem, or get a sensible debate about the problem, by saying, the Conservatives want to do this and sound tough and crackdown, but actually, *we* the Labour government are cracking down and being even tougher. That won’t solve it.” (p. 19)

CK employs the strategy of over-inclusion using *we* in his reply in order to extend the validity of his own argument to that of his party and then he over-includes even more by extending the domain of validity to an indeterminate domain using the generic reference *you* which not only includes CK himself but also his party, if not society as a whole.

In another study done by De Fina (1995) used the concept of participation framework by Goffman (1981) in order to show how pronominal selection can be tied to the identification of recipients and sources of a speech, analysed the pragmatic role that pronouns expressing person deixis have in the political speeches of two Mexican participants in a Conference on the Chiapas revolt of January 1994 in Mexico. Goffman’s (1981) participation framework refers to the roles that speakers undertake in a particular setting, for instance, in the setting of an interview, the role of asking questions is on the interviewer, while the role of responding to these questions is on the interviewee (Bramley, 2001). According to Goffman (1981), within the participation

framework, the participants may take on a different roles, or what Goffman refers as 'participation status' such as, whether he/she is speaking as an individual or on behalf of a group which he/she belongs to, for instance, an individual politician or a representative of a political party. Closely linked to the shift in participation status is the concept of footing established by Goffman (1981), which refers to the process that enables the interviewees to simultaneously shift roles as they are engaging in a talk, and one way of noticing the change in footing is through the shift in the use of personal pronouns. De Fina argued that pronominal choice in political discourse reveals differences when speakers present themselves with respect to other individuals and groups in the political field. Apart from that, the study also shows in what way consistency or the ambiguity of reference could possibly have very different effects on the way the speaker presents himself. For instance, there are no occurrences of the pronoun *I* and that self-reference is often realized through the form of the personal pronoun *our*: (i) "the first question that we were asking ourselves was about the feasibility of *our* organizations, of *our* communities and of *our* existence itself in the area". As a result, it is assumed that ratified recipients and addressees coincide in this case and most probably the main goal of the speech is to define and represent the role of a particular group of Mexicans but not to appeal to other forces.

In a study conducted by Kuo (2002), he examined how the use of the second-person singular pronoun 您 - *ni* (*you*) by three Taiwanese politicians reflects their attitudes and relations towards other participants, and their perceptions of the interactive goals of the speech activity. It is found that the use of *ni* (*you*) in these two debates is different. More than 60% occurrences of *you* are used by the three debaters when addressing the audience or referring to an indefinite person in order to establish solidarity with the audience, meanwhile more than 80% of the occurrences on 'you' in

the second debate are used when addressing the opponents with the aim to attack or challenge them, for instance from one of Chen's statements in the debate:

"To Mr. Wang, we still have to say one thing. Why years ago when we both were running for the legislature, *you* campaigned so hard that *you* even held more campaign rallies than I did? Then why didn't *you* hold campaign rallies this time but instead only collected trash? Why did *you* still have time to go to other places to campaign for other candidates?" (p. 38)

The findings support Chilton and Schaffner's (2002) claim that politicians tend to manipulate personal pronouns, especially when they are addressing their audience or political opponents.

Apart from exploring the use of second-person pronouns, Chen (2007) discussed how the first-person pronouns 我 - *wo* (*I*) and 我們 - *women* (*We*) are used in Chinese political discourse. The study has found that *I* and *we* have different uses according to their pragmatic functions in different contexts. Chen divided *I* into propositional *I* and dramatic *I*, and divided *we* into propositional *we*, impersonal *we* and the dramatic *we*. The propositional *we* takes specific referents and is further divided into audience-inclusive *we* and audience-exclusive *we* depending on its referents in which it helps them to address different people at the same time in a political talk, for instance, when they want to refer to their audience or team members, they use:

- (i) Audience-inclusive *we*, such as in this sentence: "*We* feel that there are many issues about women's rights, including *we* women's job seeking, many of *we* foreign brides and *we* women's education";
- (ii) Audience-exclusive *we*, such as in this sentence: "In the future, *we* hope to continue pushing forth and expand cross-Straits exchanges of journalism and information, education and culture".

(p. 36)

The impersonal *we* refers to anyone whereas the dramatic *we* is used when there is a role shift from the actual discourse to the situation being described. Chen found that there are frequent pronominal shifts in the data which show that the selected politicians tend to choose different pronouns for different communicative purposes, for instance, the use of the pronoun *I* is used to communicate personal thoughts or beliefs to their audience; the use of audience-exclusive *we* is to build in-group rapport with other politicians in a friendly or sarcastic way, to highlight about past achievements or future plans and the audience-inclusive *we* is to assert shared knowledge to create a collective opinion. This supports Allen's (2007) statement that the pronominal choices selected by politicians serve persuasive and strategic political functions because a careful pronoun choice could help them to present themselves in the best light in order to appeal to a diverse audience, for instance, Chen's speech data were the politicians' 2004 inaugural speech which was targeted not only to the Taiwanese, but also to the people of other countries who are interested in their future policy.

In addition, Allen (2007) investigated the pragmatics of pronominal choice and the way in which politicians construct and express their identities and the members of their parties and opponents within political speeches. Allen examined six speeches by John Howard and Mark Latham of the 2004 Australia's Federal Election campaign, and looked at the emergence of pronominal shift to generate pragmatic effects and serve a political function. This study also found that pronominal shift and ambiguous pronominal referents enable politicians to appeal to diverse audiences that help extend their ability to convince their audiences for instance, the ambiguity of the reference pronoun *we* is found to serve their political purposes: "*We* can remain faithful to our traditional allies and allegiances while building and strengthening our partnerships in the region". Similar to the findings of the study conducted by Nakkagwe (2012), Allen

found that politicians strategically include or exclude their opposition from group memberships in order to negatively present their opponents.

While the results of Nakaggwe's (2012) study suggested that *I*, *you* and *we* can be used strategically to legitimize the speaker, the personal pronouns *they* can be used to delegitimize the opposition because the use of *they* often refers to the 'other'. Nakaggwe explored how the personal pronouns *I*, *you*, *we* and *they* are used strategically in Barack Obama's speeches and has found that the personal pronouns *I*, *you* and *we* are used to enhance the 'self' and portray the opposition in a negative way; for instance when he said: "And *I* will never—I will never—turn Medicare into a voucher. No American should ever have to spend their golden years at the mercy of insurance companies. They should retire with the care and the dignity that they have earned. Yes, *we* will reform and strengthen Medicare for the long haul, but *we'll* do it by reducing the cost of health care, not by asking seniors to pay thousands of dollars more"; while the use of *they* focused more on portraying the opposition negatively, for instance, when he mentioned: "Now, our friends down in Tampa at the Republican Convention were more than happy to talk about everything *they* think is wrong with America. But *they* didn't have much to say about how *they'd* make it right. *They* want your vote, but *they* don't want you to know their plan. And that's because all *they* have to offer is the same prescriptions *they've* had for the last 30 years". The same findings were reported in Kuo's (2002) on the use of the pronoun *you* which is used to address the opponent with the intention to attack them and expose their weaknesses.

Moreover, Hakansson (2012) studied the pronominal choices made by George W. Bush and Barack Obama in their State of the Union speeches. Hakansson focused on determining whom the presidents refer to when they use the personal pronouns *I*, *you*, *we* and *they*. At the same time, the study also compares the differences in pronominal usage by these two presidents. The findings suggest that there are no significant

differences in the use of personal pronouns by these two presidents. Similar to Nakaggwe's (2002) findings, Hakkanson found that the personal pronoun *I* is often used when the speaker wants to speak as an individual and not as a representative of a group. Whereas the pronoun *you* is used as a generic pronoun which is comparable to one of Kuo's (2002) findings which reported that the pronoun *you* used by the politician has no specific referents.

In addition, Brozin (2010) suggested that Obama preferred to use *I* when he wants to personally involve with the American citizens and *you* when he wants to convince a smaller audience which is done by sharing most of his personal opinions and directly addresses the audience to convince them on the subject. Obama uses *we* when he wants to decrease his own responsibility and send a clear message about what is accepted and to exclude those who disagree with him; for instance, from one of the excerpts from the data of the study: "At these moments, America has carried on not simply because of the skill or vision of those in high office, but because *we*, the people have remained faithful to the ideals of our forebears and true to our founding documents". Instead of using the personal pronoun *I*, Obama uses *we* to avoid all the responsibility to himself.

In another study, Adegoju (2014) analysed the discursive practice of some political figures in Nigeria by examining their political speeches. The study looked at the use of personal pronouns: first-person singular and plural, second and third-person plural in the rhetorical conflict of Nigeria's "June 12th" crisis where Nigeria's presidential election was annulled, which then led to many other major crises among the Nigerians. The study revealed various strategies used by political figures to convince the Nigerians in that event. As a result, it helps to serve their interest as politicians in the conflict. Adopting tools of Critical Discourse Analysis to examine person deixis, the findings revealed that the use of the personal pronoun *we* is used as a strategy to avoid

from self-humiliation and attempt to shift the blame to a collective group as it protects the leader from any direct attack; whereas the use of the personal pronoun *our* is used to express a collective sense of belonging. The personal pronoun *I* is used to project individual identity as politicians, the use of the personal pronoun *you* is to justify their claims regarding the conflict and the use of the personal pronoun *they* is to portray a group of people (the perceived opposition) in a particular light in order to further reinforce their messages to the audiences. Similar findings in the study conducted by Jasim Mohammed Hassan (2011) examined the use of in-group and out-group pronouns in political discourse, by analysing Hosni Mubarak's speech that is known as the 'January Revolution' by the Egyptians, which concluded that Hosni often used the first person pronoun *I* in an attempt to persuade his audiences into accepting his views and actions on crises, revolutions and any controversial issues.

Bramley's (2001) examined the use of the pronouns *I*, *we*, *you* and *they* in 32 Australian political interviews held between February 1995 and March 1996. The interviews were selected from different public radio stations and television news programs that cover a wide range of topics. The politicians selected were those from the main political parties at local, state and federal level, in which their lengths of experience in politics differ and they were of both genders. The aim of the study is to examine how politicians exploit the flexibility of pronouns to enable them to construct their different 'selves' and create different 'others' in political interviews. The study is based on Conversation Analytic approach together with Goffman's (1981) participation framework, and Goffman's (1981) concept of footing. The findings revealed that these politicians often used the personal pronoun *I* to create a positive image of themselves, which is as an individual by highlighting their accomplishments, personal qualities, positive attributes and expressions of authority; whereas the personal pronoun *we* helps them to invoke collective identity and establish group membership; and more

importantly it helps to present issues collectively instead of individually as it allows them to turn away from individual attention and responsibilities; the pronoun *you* is used to refer to anyone, depending on the interviewee; and the pronoun *they* is used to differentiate the interviewee, either as an individual or a member of a group, from the others, for instance, from their opponents.

Apart from other approaches considered in the above-mentioned studies in analysing different types of pronouns, Goffman's (1981) notion of footing; and Goffman's (1981) concept of participation framework are chosen for the current study in analysing the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in DSNR's and DSAI's discourses in political interviews. The findings from the previous studies are useful in such a way that it informs the present study on Malaysian politicians' strategies in using personal pronouns in different political contexts, which would help to support the findings obtained in this current study and help reveal the purpose of the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* by DSNR and DSAI in the context of political interviews.

The next section will focus on some of the previous studies which are based on the framework of Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principles in analyzing the flouting of maxims, particularly in the context of political interviews.

2.6 The Realization of Grice's Cooperative Principles in Political Interviews

Grice claims that when we communicate with someone, we, and the people we are talking to, will be conversationally cooperative without realizing it. Grice (1975) believes that it is simply because both sides are having the same purpose of wanting to achieve mutual conversation ends where both understand and are able to relate to what is said and discussed in the interactions. Even when people are not being cooperative socially, they can still be cooperative conversationally, for instance, in an argument we

may be arguing with another person angrily, however, we still cooperate conversationally in order to argue.

The general principle of Grice's Cooperative Principles is; "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", (Grice, 1975, p. 45). Grice based his theory of cooperative principles on four sub-principles or also known as maxims which are the maxims of Quality, Quantity, Relation and Manner. People who are involved in interactions are expected to observe and follow these four maxims of cooperative principles to achieve mutual conversation ends. These maxims are explained as follows:

Table 2.6: The Conversational Maxims (Grice, 1975)

The Conversational Maxims	
Maxim of Quantity	(i) Make your contribution as informative as required (ii) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required
Maxim of Quality	(i) Do not say what you believe to be false (be truthful) (ii) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence
Maxim of Relation	(i) Be relevant
Maxim of Manner	(i) Avoid obscurity of expression (ii) Avoid ambiguity (iii) Be brief (iv) Be orderly

In order to enhance effective communication, people are expected to obey the Cooperative Principles proposed by Grice (1975) as it sets forward the idea that people should follow these principles to understand each other especially when meanings and interactions are not explicitly conveyed. The studies of political interviews in relation to the application of Grice Cooperative Principles have been the subject of many previous

studies (see Hamid M. Al-Hamadi & Behija J.Muhammed 2009, Fadhly 2012; Hanlon 2010; Li 2008; Wulan Rahayu 2012).

In a recent study by Hamid M. Al-Hamadi & Behija J.Muhammed (2009) on how western politicians respond to interview questions with or without violating any of the four maxims, they found that when the maxim of Quality is violated, all of the other maxims are affected too. Violating a maxim occurs when a person in a conversation fails to observe one or more maxims purposely to mislead or deceive the recipient. Grice (1975) states that a speaker who violates a maxim will be liable to mislead as it discourage the recipient to look for another meaning.

Likewise, Fadhly (2012) analysed the presidential interviews between the Indonesian President, President Susilo Bambang Yudoyono and eight Indonesian journalists to investigate the ways the president flouts the maxims of Cooperative Principles and determine the functions of the flouts in the interviews. Consequently, the results revealed that President Susilo Bambang Yudoyono flouted all the maxims of Cooperative Principles and the frequently flouted maxim was the maxim of Quantity. In addition, Fadhly claimed that there are four ways in which the maxims are flouted, i.e. hedging, indirectness, open-answer and detailed element. For instance, via open-answer, it does not only help him to rescue his government from public humiliation, but it also helps him to be aware of his answers by not only answering with a simple 'yes' or 'no', and instead to elaborate with a much more detailed explanation. The function of the flouts was as a face-saving act (FSA), self-protection, awareness, politeness, interestingness, control of information, elaboration as well as ignorance.

Fadhly's (2012) findings were supported by Li (2008) who studied how politicians rely on linguistic strategies in political interviews to show politeness. The people involved in this study were the spokesperson of China's Foreign Ministry and

Western journalists who interviewed him about the North Korean Nuclear crisis. The study investigated the ways in which the spokesperson violated certain maxims for certain purposes in his answers, how he generated implicature as well as how he adopted politeness strategies throughout the interviews. He found that the spokesman flouted certain maxims to protect China's positive image by simply answering the questions as commonly anticipated, and frequently flouted by drawing on the information already raised by the reporters earlier.

Hanlon's (2010) explored the ways politicians answered questions by adopting some FSA strategies to protect their reputations that could be threatened if they showed some aggressiveness or inappropriate replies or actions. The aim of Hanlon's study is to consider face-aggravation in the context of political interviews in order to suggest what "face" means and what "appropriateness" and "impoliteness" are, and how they relate to the context of political interviews. Hanlon claimed that it is difficult for the interviewees to predict the interviewer's intentions because the same behaviour can be assumed as appropriate for the politicians but inappropriate for the journalists and vice versa. For instance, when the interviewer asks questions with the intention of threatening the face of the interviewee, for example, the question: "why did you claim the schools hadn't been inspected when they had?" which logically presupposes that; a) he made the claim, and b) the schools had been inspected. However, although the question seems appropriate, the interviewee responded with "we ought to get off these trivialities and asides and go to the main fact" indicated that he does not seem to think that it is an appropriate question.

In a recent study, Wulan Rahayu (2012) investigated the realization of Grice's Cooperative Principles in a presidential interview conducted between Barack Obama and Putra Nababan, an Indonesian newsreader, journalist and editor. The study examined the application of Grice's Cooperative Principles and identified the function

of the flouts in the presidential interview. Similar to the findings reported by Fadhlly (2012), which revealed that President Susilo Bambang Yudono had flouted all four maxims, Obama too was found to have flouted all four maxims, however, at the same time he also performed politeness strategies to lessen the degree of face-threatening acts (FTA) when replying to questions. Chilton and Schaffner (2002) states that Grice argued that the Cooperative Principles is generally still expected to be functioning when the maxims are flouted, for instance, when hearers infer (and speakers expect hearers to infer) some implied meaning known as implicature. They believe that politicians practise the act of flouting to convey implied meaning, by being un-cooperative in their talk, for instance, by evading certain questions in interviews or giving ambiguous statements in political debates, because implied meaning can be easily denied.

In the above-mentioned studies, Grice's (1975) approach is used as a framework for analysing the accomplishment or flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles in political interviews. However, this approach has not been used in any of these studies in relation with the use of personal pronouns in political interviews. Thus, this current study tries to fill in the gap left in the previous studies by considering the approach that stems from two complementary sources which are employed in some of the above-mentioned studies; first is Goffman's (1981) participation framework; and Goffman's (1981) notion of footing are used to analyse the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in the current study; second is Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principles which is used to analyze the accomplishment or flouting of Grice's maxims through the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*. Consequently, these two sources help to not only show the patterns of the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in DSNR's and DSAI's discourses, but to also reveal how such uses assist in the accomplishment or flouting of the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles, particularly in the context of political interviews.

2.7 Summary of Chapter Two

In this chapter, some of the previous studies on the use of personal pronouns using the theoretical framework of discourse analysis, Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principles, Goffman's (1981) participation framework and Goffman's (1981) notion of footing in political interviews are reviewed. Most of the findings from these studies revealed that politicians strategically use personal pronouns to portray themselves in a positive light and the oppositions negatively. Whereas their observance and non-observance to the conversational maxims depend on the kind of questions they need to respond to in the political interviews. It is hoped that this study will obtain comparable findings which will help to narrow the research gap on the use of personal pronouns and how the use assists in the observance or flouting of Grice's Principles in political interviews. The next chapter will present the methods that are used to conduct this study.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the methods and procedures taken in conducting this study are presented and discussed. Besides that, the research framework that this study is based on is further explained.

3.1 Research Design

This study examines qualitatively and employs discourse analysis approach in the analysis of the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* used by Malaysian politicians in their utterances, along with their observance to the four conversational maxims of cooperative principle when responding to questions asked in interviews. Chilton and Schaffner (2002) says that political activity does not exist without the use of language, and that it is considered 'pragmatic behaviour' because it is designed to achieve specific goals and to persuade people in believing certain things.

This study deals with the data that is in form of transcribed utterances, which are the interview transcripts. The purpose of this research is to study the discourse of politicians and obtain a better understanding on how the personal pronouns *I* and *we* can play an important role and help these politicians to accomplish the meaning they intended to put across in an interview. Miles and Huberman (1994) identified three major approaches to qualitative data analysis; by interpretive approaches, social anthropological approaches and collaborative social research approaches. As for this study, the interpretive approach is used as it allows researchers to treat social action and human activity as text. This approach also helps to explore and discover the practical understandings of meanings and actions.

Since this study tends to work with text rather than numbers, it aims to produce an understanding of the importance concerning the use of the personal pronouns *I* and

we in political interviews. As a result, the interpretive approach helps readers to get a better understanding of the context which is portrayed by these politicians, particularly through their use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* and their compliance with Grice's Principles in their responses.

3.2 Research Framework

To analyse the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* by the two Malaysian political leaders in political interviews, this study is based on Goffman's (1981) notion of participation framework and Goffman's (1981) concept of footing; and to analyse the accomplishment or flouting of the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles through the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*, the framework of Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principles is used.

Goffman's (1981) participation framework explains the notions of the speaker and the hearer in a conversation. Both the speaker and the hearer are also known as the participants involved in a talk in which they mutually form the participation framework. According to Goffman (1981), the participant's role or status constantly changes as they engage in an on-going talk, and it is the recipient who interprets the speaker's talk and how the speaker positions himself throughout the talk. He further divided the roles of hearers into ratified recipient (the addressed and unaddressed recipients) and unrated recipients (the over-hearers, bystanders or eavesdroppers); and the roles of speakers into three separate production roles, which are, the animator (the one who speaks the word), author (the one who is originating the talk) and principal (the one who expresses his viewpoints and values) (as cited in Koskela, 2001). These are the roles that Goffman denotes as 'participant status', for instance, in interviews, interviewees may be speaking as individuals or on behalf of a group which they belongs to; for example in the current study, DSNR and DSAI may be speaking individually for themselves or on behalf of

their respective political parties. These different roles taken by the interviewees are what Goffman regarded as the shifts in participation status (Bramley, 2001). Whereas the concept of footing by Goffman (1981) helps to illustrate how DSNR and DSAI shift roles simultaneously as they engage in the talk in political interviews, which is mainly expressed through the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*. Goffman claims that participants constantly change their footing in a talk and these changes are a persistent feature of a natural talk and according to him, a shift in footing can be displayed through a pronoun shift, for instance, when we represent ourselves, we typically use the personal pronoun *I* however, when we are speaking on behalf of a member of a group or some special association, we present ourselves explicitly or implicitly using the personal pronoun *we*, and not *I* (as cited in Lerner & Kitzinger, 2007). Besides that, Goffman (1981) further explained that the shifts in footing can also be signaled through prosodic or paralinguistic features such as pauses, intonation, gestures and so on. However, the current study will only look at the shift of footing which is signaled through the shift in the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*. The shifts in footing and participation status are associated to the construction of identity of these politicians as it enables them to construct different identities depending on the questions they receive (Bramley, 2001). In this study, these different identities are mainly expressed through the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*.

Personal pronouns are essential in indicating shifts in participation status and footing as they enable DSNR and DSAI to construct multiple identities of ‘selves’ and help them to achieve different effects by establishing connections or isolating ‘selves’ from a particular group (Bramley, 2001). However, the shift in participation status that is indicated by the shift in footing is mainly signalled through the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in this study, which have lead them to accomplish or flout the maxims of Grice’s Cooperative Principles in a certain context of the talk. For instance,

when they receive questions that could pose a threat to their face and the political party they represent, they will evade from addressing the main questions asked by the interviewer through the shifts in personal pronouns, for instance, responding to a controversial question that requires their honest answer using the pronoun *I*, they, however, may end up giving a collective response using the pronoun *we*, which is supported by Goffman (1981) that states as a speaker engages in a discourse, he/she will sustain or change footing by selecting the footing which provides him the least self-threatening position in the circumstances, differently phrased, through the most defensible alignment he/she can muster. Goffman's (1981) notions of participation framework and Goffman's (1981) concept of footing used in this study helps the researcher to analyse the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* found in the discourse of the two Malaysian leaders in their political interviews. Apart from that, it assists the researcher to observe the change in the participation status and footing of these politicians as they respond to different types of questions. Thus, the results yield from these analyses help to answer the first research question.

Whereas in order to analyse the flouting of maxims, this study follows the general principle of Cooperative Principles by Paul Grice (1975, p.45) which states; *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*. Grice based his theory of cooperative principles on four sub-principles or also known as maxims: maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation and maxim of manner that we have to follow in order to be cooperative and understood. Table 3.2 below explains the four sub-principles or better known as the conversational maxims with some examples that could assist in the understanding of Grice's Cooperative Principles.

Table 3.2: The Explanation and Examples of Grice's Conversational Maxims

Conversational Maxims	Explanation and Examples
Maxim of Quantity	<p>A speaker should be as informative as required, and should not say more or less than is required.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <p>A : Where is Andrew?</p> <p>B : Andrew put on his boots, picked up his coats, switched off the fan, put out the cat, got ready for his ten-minute walk to the train station.</p> <p>C : Joe went out five minutes ago to buy some groceries. I guess he will be back in 15 minutes.</p> <p>Explanation: B's responses contribute more information than is required. The content is too long. Whereas C's responses are short and concise but helps to inform A of Joe's whereabouts.</p>
Maxim of Quality	<p>As a speaker, we have to tell the truth or something that is provable by adequate evidence.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <p>X : Who is the current Prime Minister of Malaysia?</p> <p>Y : It is Dato' Seri Najib Tun Abdul Razak.</p> <p>Explanation: Y's responses indicate the truth about who is the current Prime Minister of Malaysia. Truthful and evidence are needed to fulfil this cooperative principle.</p>
Maxim of Relation	<p>Our response has to be relevant to the topic of discussion.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <p>X : Have you done the laundry?</p> <p>Y : My car is broken.</p> <p>Explanation: Y move away from the particular topic being asked and discussed. Y's response is not answering X's question. Y tries to direct X's attention away from the question which Y does not like.</p>

Maxim of Manner	<p>We have to avoid ambiguity or obscurity; we should be direct and straightforward.</p> <p>For instance:</p> <p>F : What are your plans for this afternoon?</p> <p>G : I am going to take the K-I-D-S for a W-A-L-K.</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>It is assumed that G knows that the kids can't spell, and so will not recognize the spellings of the words kids and walk. So G must not want the kids to hear actual utterances of the word 'kids' and 'walk' as most likely, the kids would recognize these words if they were actually uttered, and would then get too excited. G knows that F is competent enough to engage in the reasoning.</p>
-----------------	---

Grice's (1975) framework on Cooperative Principles explains that in order for speakers to achieve a successful communication, they must observe these four conversational maxims. According to Yule (1996), when we engage in a conversation, we normally assume that the people we are talking to is giving an appropriate amount of information; we assume that he/she is telling the truth, being relevant and trying to be clear as they possibly can; and it is these principles that we generally assumed in normal interaction, but are not aware of, because it works outside our consciousness. Grice (1989) further notes that, flouting of maxims is one of the ways in which maxims are not fulfilled in an ordinary conversation; and this is further explained by Yule (1996) which states that when a speaker flouts a certain maxim in a conversation, they are trying to convey an additional meaning without directly stating it and it is the listener who recognizes those additional meaning based on their own inferences. This act of conveying an added meaning without directly expressing it is also known as implicature. For instance, the current study aims to examine how does the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* assist DSNR and DSAI in the accomplishment or flouting of the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles in political interviews; and if they are

found to be flouting certain maxims, the first question that this study tries to seek is, what is the implied meaning that they are trying to put across about them as political party leaders and about the political party they represent, to the interviewer and the overhearing audience?; and the second question is, how do the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* assist them in the process of conveying this intended meaning in the interviews? Many researchers have adopted Grice's framework into different political contexts such as political debates, political speeches, political campaigns, and so on. However, there are fewer studies that have used Grice's framework in the context of political interviews, in relation with the use of personal pronouns. Thus, this study aims to analyse the instances of the accomplishment or flouting of maxims in political interviews, that is expressed through the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in the discourse of DSNR and DSAI. Hence, the results yield from these analyses help to answer the second research question.

In the analysis of the transcript, this study also considers the linguistic material in the surrounding text which is also referred as co-text. Yule (2006, p. 98) claims that the co-text of a word is the set of other words used in the same phrase or sentence, for instance, the example taken from Harwood's (2007) which states that although the pronoun *we* in the sentence "First, *we* consider audience costs..." helps to organise the discourse, the adverbial 'First' also plays a part in organising the text and subsequently the word 'First' helps to bring in textual effect. Similarly in this study, the expression *I mean* and *you know* found in the discourse of the two politicians have helped them to organise their talk in the interviews. Therefore, the expression *I mean* which is marked as a metadiscourse marker, and particularly referred as the reformational marker (Hyland, 2007) that falls under the category of code glosses; and the expression *you know* which is marked as an interactional marker (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015)

that are found in the discourse of these politicians are considered in this study because they are accounted as co-text.

3.3 Data

3.3.1 Selection of Data

The data chosen for this study are two sets of recorded video interviews for each politician, which are downloaded from YouTube and the video interviews are manually transcribed. Two sets of transcripts have been retrieved each from Dato' Seri Najib Tun Abdul Razak's recorded video interviews sourced from one of the International news channels, Al-Jazeera English whereas the transcripts of Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim's interviews are sourced from Journeyman.tv and ANC Alerts respectively. The duration of each interview is approximately within 25 minutes. However, there are some grammatical errors that are not amended in the conversations because the utterances appear to be as it is in the discourse of these politicians in each of the political interviews. Therefore, there will be some grammatical mistakes found in the interview transcripts as it is common to make errors in oral conversation.

3.3.2 Selection of Subject

This study uses political interviews transcripts as data in order to obtain a valid sample regarding the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*; and the observance to the four conversational maxims by two famous Malaysian politicians, Dato' Seri Najib Tun Razak (DSNR), the Prime Minister of Malaysia; and Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim (DSAI), the Leader of the Opposition party, in political interviews. These politicians were chosen for the reasons below:

Firstly, both of them are leaders representing their own political parties; Barisan Nasional (the pro-government) and Parti Keadilan Rakyat (the opposition) who took

part in General Election 13 campaign which was held on May 5th, 2013. Besides, they possess distinctive leadership qualities as a leader, and they have their own strategies in gaining supporters, which include the strategic use of personal pronouns they employed in their responses in their respective interviews. Hence, for that reason, they are deemed as the best subjects chosen for this study as this study aims to look at the strategic use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* by DSNR and DSAI in their political interviews before the commencement of General Election 13.

Secondly, as party leaders, DSNR and DSAI are viewed as 'controversial figures' as both of them have dealt with disputable political controversies in Malaysia. In the beginning of his administration years, DSNR faces criticisms regarding his administration. Recently he was associated with 1MDB scandal and the loss of money, a total of RM2.6 billion. As for DSAI, he faces sodomy accusations twice, in 1998 and 2014. There were also criticisms concerning his role as the opposition leader in which people criticized him for making his party as a 'family dynasty' as a result of his action appointing his wife Datin Seri Wan Azizah Wan Ismail and his daughter, Nurul Izzah to be in that party too.

Thirdly, DSNR and DSAI both came from different backgrounds. DSNR is regarded as political aristocracy because he is the son of Abdul Razak Hussein, Malaysia's second Prime Minister, and the nephew of the third Prime Minister, Hussein Onn. In contrary to that, DSAI was not born into an aristocratic family. As a student in the University of Malaya (UM), DSAI was the president of the National Union of Malaysian Muslim Students and he was also the president of the University of Malaya Malay Language Society (PBMUM). He became actively involved in politics after joining the United Malays National Organisation (UMNO), led by Mahathir bin Mohamad, who had become the fourth Prime Minister of Malaysia in 1981.

Despite their political controversies and struggles, both of them have gone through their own remarkable experiences and challenges in their political journey as politicians and as party leaders. In addition, although they have different approaches in governance, they are very firm with their principles in leading their political parties. Hence, for those reasons, they are chosen as the subjects of this study, which main objective is to look at their use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in their interview responses prior to General Election 13.

This study attempts to address two research questions based on the two research objectives formulated, which are; to study the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* by the two Malaysian prominent leaders and the possible reasons behind their use in political interviews; and to investigate in what ways does the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* assist in the accomplishment or flouting of Grice's Conversational Maxims demonstrated by the two Malaysian prominent leaders in political interviews.

Table 3.3.2: Information on the Political Interviews

No	Date uploaded on YouTube by the news Channel:	Interviews	Name of Politicians	Name of Journalist	News Channel	Duration
1.	26 April 2013	Talk to Al Jazeera - Najib Razak: Malaysia's election challenge (Transcript1NR-Extracts 1-12)	Dato' Seri Najib Tun Abdul Razak	Veronica Pedrosa	Al-Jazeera English	25:01 minutes
2.	4 February 2010	Najib 101 East Interview (Transcript2NR-Extracts 1-11)	Dato' Seri Najib Tun Abdul Razak	Fauziah Ibrahim	Al-Jazeera English	24:00 minutes
3.	7 March 2012	The World Tomorrow: Anwar Ibrahim (Transcript1AI-	Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim	Julian Assange	Journeym an.tv	28:11 minutes

		Extracts 1-11)				
4.	2 February 2010	Ricky Carandang with Anwar Ibrahim (Transcripts 2AI-Extracts 1-9)	Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim	Ricky Carandang	ANC	24:00 minutes

3.4 Research Procedures

The set of data for this study is taken from a range of recorded videos of political interviews downloaded from YouTube, sourced from the main news channel that reports on politics. The political interviews are chosen based on the pre-election context in Malaysia, between the years of 2010 to 2013, prior to General Election 13. Besides that, the length of the video interviews is also taken into consideration which is approximately within 25 minutes for each interview. Due to the limited source in getting the local interviews using English as the medium of communication, this study focuses on interviews that are held with international journalists in order to preserve the natural occurring data and to avoid from politically biased issues.

After the initial transcription of the transcripts was done, transcription notations were included and verified by a transcriptionist. These interviews are transcribed using the transcription convention developed by Atkinson and Heritage (1984) which helps to capture the details of the talk, for instance, the word stress and the pauses in the turns in which pronouns occurred. The reason for using the transcription convention of Atkinson and Heritage (1984) over other transcription conventions available is because their transcription notation is a naturalized transcription which focuses on transcribing talk and examining it for patterns. Moreover, the notations are suitable for a researcher who wishes to examine the details of a spoken discourse because it suits the needs of word for word presentation of a discourse of a natural occurring talk which also helps to lessen misrepresentation especially when examining the talk (Oliver, Serovich & Mason, 2005).

Then, the extracts were organised based on the themes of political affairs, governance, political party affairs, foreign affairs, presidential legacy and personal issues which were verified based on the topic of discussions in the interviews. Then, the occurrences of the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in each extract were identified. By categorising the extracts according to themes, it will assist the researcher/readers to identify the themes with the highest or lowest use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*; and, highest or lowest occurrences of flouting or observance to Grice's Cooperative Principles. Besides that, it will also help to inform the readers about the discourse function of each pronoun analysed.

In order to answer the first research question, the discourse of each politician was read line by line, and the occurrences of the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* were identified. Once the pronouns were identified, the discourse functions of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* were then determined, for instance, *I* as self-reference, *I* as self-clarification, *we* as a member of a political party and *we* as a Malaysian so forth. Next, the shift in the use of the pronouns *I* to *we* and *we* to *I* in a sentence and throughout the discourse was closely observed, this is because the shift in the use of the pronouns will help to indicate the shifts in the speaker's participation status and when the change of footing occurred, as outlined by Goffman (1981). Once the shifts have been identified, the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* was analysed.

In order to answer the second research question, the researcher then identified whether the questions asked required the politicians to respond as an individual (indicated by the use of the pronoun *I*) or as a group (indicated by the use of the pronoun *we*). If they are able to address the main questions asked by the interviewer using the personal pronouns *I* and *we*, they are considered as having observed the four conversational maxims as outlined by Grice (1975); however, if they fail to address one of the main questions asked by the interviewer, they are already considered as flouting

the Grice's Cooperative Principles. Next, the researcher examined how the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* by each politician in each of the interviews assisted them to escape from responding to certain questions and led them in the accomplishment or flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles.

3.5 Reliability

Firstly, in order to overcome the threats of unreliability of the data, which is the sets of interviews, it is important to note that the interviews were selected from a reliable source i.e. the main news channel that reports on worldwide politics, for instance Al-Jazeera English, ANC Alerts and Journeyman.tv. To ease in the process of analysis of the data, the interview was first transcribed by the researcher and it was then verified by an experienced transcriptionist who holds a Bachelor's Degree of Education (Hons.) TESL from Universiti Teknologi Mara (UiTM), Shah Alam and is currently pursuing her Master's Degree in Linguistics at the Universiti of Malaya (UM), Kuala Lumpur. During her undergraduate studies, she took Translation Studies and Pragmatics and she also learnt about Conversational Analysis. She also has almost three years of experience transcribing talk, such as political interviews and speeches.

Next, in order to counter the threat of unreliability and biasedness in the analyses of the data, the analyses were verified by a Master's Degree holder of Education (Hons.) TESL from Universiti Teknologi Mara (UiTM), Shah Alam, who is currently working as a lecturer in UiTM, Shah Alam for four years and has high interest in world politics. The verifications were made based on how much she agreed or disagreed to each of the analysis made by the researcher. She also verified the categorisation of each extract according to its theme. Afterward, to counter the threat of unreliability of the methods used in this study, the researcher referred to some of the previous studies mentioned in Chapter 2 which adopted the same method in analysing the use of personal pronouns,

for instance the studies done by Bull and Fetzer (2006), De Fina (1995) and Bramley (2001). Apart from online journals and articles in the area of Discourse Analysis, these previous studies have helped to guide the researcher in deciding the most suitable framework and methods to be used in conducting this study.

3.6 Research Analysis

Content analysis was used to analyse the interview transcripts to identify the contexts in which the personal pronouns *I* and *we*, as well as the flouts or observance to conversational maxims took place in the political interviews. This approach helps to not just look for the meanings, but also the relationships between words and concepts within various forms of data.

First and foremost, the personal pronouns *I* and *we* are classified as a First-Person pronouns in which *I* is the singular form that refers to the speaker, whereas *We* is the plural form that also refers to the speaker, but inclusive of the others. The First-Person pronouns were chosen for several reasons. Firstly, it is because the use of *I* and *we* in a discourse is more truthful, complete and objective as it puts the speaker in the picture in which it reflects the speaker's involvement.

Secondly, it allows the speaker to give a clear description of his perspectives and personal experience and it helps them to give clarity. The use of First-Person pronoun becomes even more important when his stance has to incorporate or respond to someone else's, e.g. the interviewer. Since it allows the speaker to include their perspectives, as a result, it implies the effect it may have on his stance. Defining his perspectives gives his audiences the context of his stance. More importantly, it helps to give the 'whole picture' honesty when a speaker is making claims.

Thirdly, the use of First-Person pronoun helps to focus the audiences' attention on the subject (the speaker) rather than the object (the issue) as it allows them to employ

deference and ownership/involvement in the same sentence. In addition, it ensures the speaker's choices in the context of his discourse; for instance, to whom he is referring to in his talk, and simultaneously helps to deliver the kind of information he is trying to communicate to their audiences.

Finally, the pronouns *you*, *my* and *our* are also considered in some part of the analysis because the pronouns *you* in the interviewer's questions helped to signal that the interviewee is required to respond as an individual instead of collectively, while the pronouns *my* is significant in the presentation of 'self' similar to the pronouns *I*; and the use of *our* is significant in the presentation of a collective identity similar to the pronouns *we* in political interviews, especially when these pronouns are used in the same sentence with the personal pronouns *I* and *we*.

3.7 Summary of Chapter Three

In this chapter, the methods taken in carrying out the study are explained. The framework of Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principles, Goffman's (1981) participation framework and Goffman's (1981) notion of footing are presented. The procedures taken in the process of analysing the research data, in an attempt to answer each research question posed in Chapter 1 are justified. It is hoped that with these approaches taken to conduct this study, it will help to achieve comparable findings which will help to explain about the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*; and the accomplishment or flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles in political interviews. The next chapter will present the analysis of the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*, and the accomplishment or flouting of the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles by DSNR and DSAI in political interviews.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the analyses of the interviews of Dato' Seri Najib Razak (DSNR) and Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim (DSAI) and they are organised in this manner: interview transcripts (divided into extracts and categorised according to themes: 4.1.1 Political Affairs - issues on internal or external politically motivated actions, 4.1.2 Governance – issues that are related to the act of running or managing a country or government, 4.1.3 Political Party Affairs - issues that are related to political party matters/activities, 4.1.4 Foreign Affairs – topics that are related to social and political issues in other countries, 4.1.5 Presidential Legacy – topics on how the interviewee wants to be remembered as a politician/president/prime minister; and 4.1.6 Personal Issues – topics that are related to the interviewee's personal life matters) followed by the discussions of analyses. The number in the far left column refers to each of the lines of the discourse. Transcript 1NR refers to Najib Razak's (NR) first interview with Veronica Pedrosa (VP). Transcript 2NR refers to Najib Razak's second interview with Fauziah Ibrahim (FI). Transcript 1AI refers to Anwar Ibrahim's (AI) first interview with Julian Assange (JA). Transcript 2AI refers to Anwar Ibrahim's second interview with Ricky Carandang (RC). Each of the extracts contains a question/several questions posed by the interviewer, followed by the responses from the interviewee in reply to the questions asked in the interview.

The following notational conventions by Atkinson and Heritage (1984) are used in the extracts in this chapter. It is more comprehensive and widely used in conversational analysis as it helps to capture what was said and the way in which it was said in a series of discussion for instance, in an interview.

Table 4.0 Transcription Notations (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984)

Examples	Explanation
A: <u>That's</u> my view. A: That's my:: view.	<u>Underlined</u> items were hearably stressed. Colon(s) indicate stretching of preceding sound or letter.
A: .hhh That's my view. A: hhhh At least for now.	<u>Strings of 'h'</u> mark audible breathing. The longer the string, the longer the breath. A period preceding denotes inbreath; no period denotes outbreath.
A: That's my view.= B: =But should it be?	<u>Equal signs</u> indicate that one event followed the other with no intervening silence. (latching)
A: That's my () At (least for now).	<u>Open parentheses</u> indicate transcriber's uncertainty as to what was said. <u>Words in parentheses</u> represent a best hearably as to what was said.
A: That's my view? B: But it should be.	<u>Punctuation marks</u> capture intonation at unit boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ period=falling (indicates a stopping fall in tone, with some sense of completion, but not necessarily the end of a sentence); ▪ comma=slightly rising (indicates a slightly rising tone giving a sense of continuation); ▪ question mark=rising (indicates a rising tone which may or may not indicate a question) <p>The first subsequent word should not start after these punctuation marks convention with capital letter as it only indicates intonation.</p>
Within parenthesis: A: come in (2.1) hello mr Or between utterances: A: stop right up (1.3)	Pauses are timed in tenths of a second and inserted within parenthesis, either within utterance.

B: Ok as u wish	
A: and did you look at the – brick shop?	A short untimed pause within an utterance is indicated by a dash.
((pause)) A: are you ready to order ((pause)) B: yes thank you we are	Untimed gaps between utterances are described with double parentheses and inserted when they occur.
A: now are the details the same as when you applied? B: [yes A: [back in Road A?	SIMULTANEOUS UTTERANCES: When two speakers start talking at the same time, their utterances are linked together by a left hand bracket.
A: no, I think you crossed the wrong ones there just ah [(xxx)] B: [right]	OVERLAPPING UTTERANCES: These are marked with left and right hand brackets to show which parts of the speakers' utterances occur simultaneously.

4.1 Analysis

The themes are organised accordingly following the highest to the lowest number of extracts. Therefore, the first theme takes on political affairs, followed by the themes on governance, political party affairs, foreign affairs, presidential legacy and personal issues. As the themes on presidential legacy and personal issues have the same number of extracts; the theme that discusses more on politics takes priority over topics on personal matters, hence, the theme on personal issues comes after presidential legacy.

Table 4.1 Categorisations of Extracts According to Theme

Extracts Themes	1NR	2NR	1AI	2AI
Political Affairs	Extract 1 Extract 9 Extract 10	Extract 3 Extract 6 Extract 7 Extract 9 Extract 10	Extract 1 Extract 2 Extract 4 Extract 5 Extract 8 Extract 9	Extract 2 Extract 3 Extract 4 Extract 9
Governance	Extract 5 Extract 6 Extract 7 Extract 8	Extract 1 Extract 2 Extract 4	Extract 10 Extract 11	Extract 5 Extract 6 Extract 7
Political Party Affairs	Extract 2 Extract 3 Extract 4 Extract 11	Extract 5 Extract 8	-	-
Foreign Affairs	-	-	Extract 6 Extract 7	Extract 1
Presidential Legacy	Extract 12	Extract 11	-	-
Personal Issues	-	-	Extract 3	Extract 8

4.1.1 Theme: Political Affairs

1NR Extract 1

- 1 VP: Prime Minister Najib Razak (.) thank you very much fo:r joining us on talk to
2 Al-Jazeera. We appreciate that it must be an extraordinarily .hhh busy and
3 crucial time for you. .hhh There are: descriptions hh of the election ahea::d has
4 been indeed a struggle for - the – Mala:y souls as it were. Do you think that's a
5 fair enou:gh description?
- 6 NR: Hhuh let me put it this way (.) I think this is will be:: this will be a very hard
7 fo:ught robust election. Huhh huh but I will commit (.) because in the sense it's
8 reflective of how far .hhh we've come and in the - in the - democratic process in
9 Malaysia (.) how much more matured .hhh in that sense (0.3) hhuh but um (0.3)
10 as a political party (0.1) huh we we have (0.2) been power for 55 years (.)
11 .hhh but within this time (.) we have brought - in a real change and development
12 in Malaysia. (0.2) So although I expect this to be huh a keen effort contest:: but
13 the (0.3) I'm consciously optimistic (0.1) that the voters wi:ll return huh Barisan
14 Nasional (.) national front - back into par.
- 15 VP: Ho::w do you: personally feel about that? You've been hh in politics since
16 you were 22 (?) you come from .hhh um political dynasty.
- 17 NR: In that sense but huh my father died (0.3) when I entered politics so (.) he he
18 was not there to ensure .hhh that I I rose in politics (.) I I had to do it - my way
19 or lead with the good family name. I had no doubt about that. That helped (.)
20 .hhh but huh I had to defend for myself (.) you know I had to show that (0.3) I
21 could stand on my own (.) a:nd hhuh I'm proud of my: personal record (0.2)
22 because hhuh I've risen through the ranks (.) step by step (.) (0.3) and now I'm
23 -privileged and honoured to be able to: lead this country (.) and lead huh my
24 party.

In this extract, VP started off the interview by asking NR a question that is related to NR's political agenda for the 13th General Election with VP stating that the election has been described as a struggle to gain the Malay votes and wanting NR to confirm it. In the first part of his response, NR uses the pronoun *I* as self-expression (Line 6) which enables him to express his personal opinion as the leader of BN about the descriptions made about his party for GE 13, by considering the event to be a 'hard fought robust election' for BN to win the Malay votes. This way, it helps NR to lessen the negativity raised from the statement which inferred that BN has a hard time convincing Malays to vote for BN. By turning the negative word 'struggle' into a positive 'hard fought robust election', NR suggests that BN is going to give their all and create an eventful election along the process.

There is a slight pause and hedge from the phrase *Hhuh let me put it this way (.) I think this is will be:: this will be a very hard fo:ught robust election* in Line 6 before responding to VP's question. Using a hedge, NR infers that he is not implicating that BN is indeed struggling to gain the Malay votes in particular. The pause and hedge suggest that he is buying more time to look for the right words. NR seems to want the audience and VP to decide whether it is a yes or no by providing the necessary information and diverting the audiences' attention on the 'struggle for Malay souls' to what BN has achieved so far and the developments BN has made.

In his attempt to avoid answering the questions with a yes-no answer, NR is basically just giving a general answer which does not specifically refer to the Malay people. Instead of commenting on the issue of the party's 'struggle', NR highlights the contribution made by BN in Malaysia. However, by failing to give a direct answer, NR has flouted the maxim of Relation which states that a yes or no question requires a yes or no answer. Instead, NR uses the pronoun *we* as a member of BN and talks about UMNO being in power, about how much BN has done in the 55 years and therefore, flouted the maxim of Quantity. NR also associates the use of *we* in Line 10 with the actions taken by them as a party in the past, which suggest that they are a strong and credible government.

When NR uses *I* in Lines 6 to 14, the word *it* refers to BN having to work extra hard to convince the voters, which is why he talked about being in the democratic process and how Malaysia has matured in that sense. The use of *I* in this line infers NR's high-level personal involvement and commitment towards establishing a positive self-representation to legitimize himself as a Prime Minister of Malaysia and the leader of the coalition of the government. Whereas in Line 8, instead of continuing with *I*, note that there is a shift in his participation status as he switches to collective identity *we* as a Malaysian to suggest that as a Malaysian, he is concerned about Malaysia's future and

well-being. The pronoun *I* enables NR to explicitly state his expectation on the upcoming election, that he is optimistic his party will return to be in power to govern Malaysia in the next term which infers that NR is trying to establish a positive self-presentation of himself as well as his party in order to convince the audience that they are qualified and deserve to win since they have been able to sustain their power in the government for more than 55 years.

For the first question asked by VP in this extract, the words/phrases that NR uses along with the pronoun *I* to explain his answers, for instance - hard-fought robust election, keen effort contest and consciously optimistic depict him as a Prime Minister who is optimistic; as a way to convince the audiences of his credibility and reliability as a leader to govern Malaysia. Whereas for the second question, NR's uses *I* in his responses to suggest that even though he was regarded as political aristocracy because he was the son of Malaysia's second Prime Minister, he began his journey in politics on his own, and rose in politics as a result of his own effort, without obtaining any support from his father.

1NR Extract 9

- 1 VP: Prime Minister (.) while we're talking about situation in Eastern Malaysia: (.)
2 let's talk a little bit (.) about Sabah. There: was an extraordinary: almost biza::rre
3 event (.) with the Lahad hhh Datu standoff. When - huh people ca:me and landed
4 from the Philippines (.) heavily a:rmed men - fighters. They:: (0.1) then - got into
5 a deadly situation. So it - kinda mo::ve from biza:rre to downright brutal (.) .hhh
6 and the Malaysia Arm Forces acted very: um cracked down (.) very ha::rd some
7 would say. Hhh can you tell us what you: think happened why:: this occurred?
8 NR: First of all (.) we wanted to avoid any bloodshed. Hhuh so huh my:: huh
9 mandate to the - Security Forces is that (.) you know (.) we should try diplomacy
10 first. Hhuh our (0.2) and then we allowed (.) (0.2) you know time (.) befo::re we
11 decided that huh (0.4) we need that to take military actions against them (.) but
12 they they are the ones who actually started .hhh huh shooting and killing two of
13 our policemen. And the:: (0.2) at that point of time (.) I decided that the (0.6)
14 enough is enough. (.) and I ordered them a complete the hhh huh cracked down
15 on them. It is a legitimate response hhh of any government. .hhh But
16 nevertheless (.) we did allow them sometime (.) hhh huh for diplomacy to take
17 place (.) but unfortunately, hhh they [chose otherwise].
18 VP: [But did you]
19 NR: The word is bizarre because really a hundred men hhh you know crossing over
20 (.) even though as you said (.) heavily armed (.) couldn't possibly hhh you know
21 to try to to overthrow a government or takeover Sabah or even a small part of
22 Sabah. (0.3) And huh certainly huh whatever they did is inexcusable (.) huh
23 because hhh huh it was suicidal. It was a suicidal mission. And:: the you know
24 for them to have done it (.) there must be some kind of huh huh promise for
25 them (.) or some supports. (0.4)

VP highlighted the recent issue that took place in Lahad Datu, Sabah that witnessed a group of armed men identified to be followers of a self-proclaimed Sultan of Sulu known as Jamalulul Kiram III, who were trying to invade Sabah. The group of over a hundred people led by Jamalul's brother, known as Agbimuddin Kiram wanted to 'reclaim' part of Borneo as their ancestral land. On 9th February 2013, the group had entered Malaysia by boat, and gathered at Felda Sahabat 17 in Kampung Tanduo, Lahad Datu. The nation was shocked by the news as it had resulted in chaos among the locals in Sabah which had caused over 80 of them to run from their homes, terrified that their life would be threatened.

In response to the questions, NR uses the pronoun *we* as a member of BN as he speaks on behalf of the members of his party, and these instances of *we* help him to associate his party's past and present actions in dealing with the group and bring the focus of the

interview on the actions taken by the government. Likewise, the use of *we* helps NR to portray BN and its members in a positive light and suggests that they have taken the matter very seriously by listing out their actions towards addressing the problem and how they prioritize the lives of the people threatened by the incident. The use of *we* as a member of BN leads to the flouting of the maxim of Quantity, as NR fails to provide adequate information about the event; and the flouting of the maxim of Manner as he fails to clearly state what are the roots of the crisis that trigger the event.

Next, take note that there is a participation status shift from the use of the pronoun *we* as a member of BN to the use of the pronoun *I* as self-assertion to assert on the actions he had taken and considered as a leader of the country when dealing with the issue that threatened the country's security and peace, for instance the use of *I* in the phrase *I decided* (Line 13) and *I ordered them* (Line 14) is used to highlight his authority as a Prime Minister in handling the situation, especially when he highlighted that these armed people are trying *to overthrow the government* (Line 21) which challenges his position as the Prime Minister of Malaysia. At the same time, it shows that he is the person of the highest authority who is responsible in making decisions and taking actions towards solving the matter for the sake of the people of his country. There are also the occurrences of the discourse marker *you know* (Lines 19 and 20) which functions as interpersonal markers (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015) in which are used by NR to indicate his shared knowledge and attitude in order to show that he is aware that the audiences have some knowledge of the event that took place in Lahad Datu presented in the interview.

1NR Extract 10

- 1 VP: Do you expect the election impact (,) because what my understanding is that
2 there were some hhh talk about the - ethnic group to which the fighters belong::
3 .hhh um which lives on both sides of the border (,) .hhh huh disputed as it is. Um
4 (0.2) the they want to break away from the Barisan Nasional coalition.
- 5 NR: No (?). About - first of all (,) let me correct you the huh the international huh
6 demarcation has solely been settled. So there's no dispute about that. .hhh huh
7 secondly (,) the Suluk people are very happy (,) to be part of Malaysia (,) and to
8 support the Barisan Nasional government. In fact (,) huh hhh immediately after
9 the incident (,) we: engaged with the leader of Suluk community and they
10 expressed (,) .hhh the wholehearted support huh for the Barisan Nasional
11 government. So I don't see: this as huh affecting our political standing (,) if
12 anything at all (,) hhh it has strengthen Barisan Nasional position in Sabah.
- 13 VP: Um in the Philippines (,) there a sense that the Malaysians are:: cracking down (,)
14 o:n (0.1) people who have moved there from the Philippines and there are many
15 who are illegal hhh stateless. Um that - they're fleeing the country. What really
16 happens in - down there?
- 17 NR: There's no crack down as such (,) but the - we do need to have a long term
18 solution (,) .hhh because the problem of illegal huh immigrants (,) in Sabah is a
19 big issue (,) huh particularly with the Kadazandusun. Hhuh they feel ve::ry very
20 uncomfortable (,) with the presence of so many illegals .hhh huh in in in Sabah.
21 So we do need huh to have a long term solution (,) hhh but the long term
22 solution that must respect human rights (,) of of of of those including the
23 illegals.

The issues discussed in this extract are related to the Suluk people who are said to not be in favour of the government, as well as on the cracked down of illegal immigrants from the Philippines found in Lahad Datu, Sabah, who were suppressed and were said to be fleeing from their country. According to Sabah Chief Minister, Datuk Seri Musa Aman, the highest number of illegal immigrants found in Sabah, specifically Lahad Datu, were Filipinos who were then deported from January to July 2013. Sabah is believed to be one of the transit points of trafficked Filipinos who were on their way to other parts of Asia.

In response to VP's question about the Suluk people who were against BN, NR confidently replied with a strong 'no' emphasizing that the matter had already been settled and there are no unresolved issues regarding the incident. NR's response shows that he tried to lessen the negativity of the event, and seems to be very optimistic over what had happened in Lahad Datu. The use of the pronoun *I* as self-assertion (Line 11)

helps NR to express his stands as the leader of the government about the issue, perhaps to show that he does not think BN's reputation will be badly affected in the upcoming election, instead, because they have gained the support of the Suluk people subsequent to the incident by claiming that they immediately engaged with the leader of Suluk community soon after the event settled.

The use of the pronoun *we* as a member of the party (Lines 17 and 21) in NR's responses suggest the government's efficiency as a team in solving the problem and gaining the support of the Suluk people to Barisan Nasional. Moreover, it helps to invoke a general collective attitude to that matter, which shows that the party is highly concerned with the issue. Nevertheless, NR acknowledged the issues regarding illegal immigrants in Malaysia and in response to that, NR suggests that they need a long term solution which they are currently planning for; as they are the ones with ultimate authorities to solve the problem of illegal immigrants in Sabah. The use of the pronoun *we* as a member of BN leads to the flouting of the maxim of Quantity as NR failed to address the question asked by VP regarding the fighters' ethnic groups and on the issue saying that the fighters wanted to break away from Barisan Nasional. Instead, NR presents his position on the issue in a very positive light. Subsequently, in a way, NR also flouted the maxim of Manner when he directs the audiences' attention on things like *the Suluk community expressed wholehearted support for the Barisan Nasional government* (Lines 9 and 10).

The use of the personal pronoun *we* as a member of BN upon discussing the issue helps to invoke a general collective attitude to that matter, which shows that the party is highly concerned with the matter and at the same time, it shows that they highly value human rights and respect.

2NR Extract 3

- 1 FI: =About PERKASA (,) has said that you know as hhh the group that represents
2 hhh huh the Malay groups that fear their special privileges ma:y be taken away
3 from them (.) they (?) have [said (,)]
4 NR: [yes]
5 FI: that you know in the next election hhh they may not [support UMNO because of]
6 this action that you ma:y be taking =
7
8 NR: [No no (,) that's not true.]
9 =No no (,) that's not true (,) that - they are - by lar:ge supportive of UMNO (,)
10 hhh and they believe that UMNO is the only vehicle (0.4) huh that can really
11 hhuh huh (0.2) not only promote Malay interests (,) but there's you know (,)
12 really really um huh hold this country together. I think UMNO hhh is a stro:ng
13 party (,) UMNO is well-established (,) UMNO (,) can deal with the emergence
14 of PERKASA as well as other groups as well.

The Malay special privileges mentioned by FI is referring to Article 153 of the Consitution of Malaysia, which specified quotas for Bumiputeras in some of the areas, such as, positions in the civil service, scholarships and educational facilities, permits for any business trading as well as places in the higher instutions, for example, universities, colleges and polytechnics. According to FI, PERKASA was afraid that these special privileges for the Bumiputera will be trampled over or taken away because of the implementation of the 1Malaysia concept introduced by NR which promotes fairness and equality among different ethnic groups.

In response to FI's description about the criticisms made by PERKASA towards the implementation of 1Malaysia and their refusals to support UMNO in the upcoming election as a way of showing their disapproval, NR uses the pronoun *I* as a self-expression in *I think UMNO hhh is a stro:ng party (,) UMNO is well-established (,) UMNO (,) can deal with the emergence of PERKASA as well as other groups as well* (Lines 12 to 14) that enables NR to highlight UMNO's strength as a party and shares his personal opinion about PERKASA in which he is positive that the description of the statements made by PERKASA is entirely false because according to him, PERKASA

is majorly supportive of UMNO in contrary to FI's statement. There is also the use of the word 'you know' that functions as interpersonal markers (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015) for NR to indicate his shared knowledge which shows that he is aware that the audiences have some knowledge about the information he presented.

NR however declined to comment on the remarks made by PERKASA, instead NR uses positive words/phrases about UMNO to present UMNO in the best of light to the overhearing audiences, for instance, the words/phrases used are: *UMNO is the only vehicle to promote Malay interests*, *UMNO is a strong party*, and *UMNO is well-established* which simultaneously promote UMNO as well as suggesting that he is very optimistic about UMNO despite the criticisms that were made against them. Based on NR's response, he does not give adequate information that is supported by evidence to actually show that PERKASA has never made that claim and evidence to show that PERKASA is by large supportive of UMNO which indicates that he flouted the maxim of Quality and Quantity. In regard to his response, it only demonstrates that NR is trying his best to protect UMNO's image and put a positive spin to the negative remarks made by PERKASA as described by FI.

2NR Extract 6

- 1 FI: =How [long do you think it] take befo::re Malaysia can be rid of race based
2 politics (.) before .hhh someone stop (.) saying somebody is a Malayay or and
3 Indian or a Chinese and sa:ys that they are Malaysians first? =
- 4 NR: [to transform Malaysia.]
5 =It's an evolution (.) it's a change of mindset hhh and huh you cannot legislate
6 hhuh huh you cannot make la::ws (.) it's the change in mindset. And and I and I
7 think it's (0.2) it might take a bit of ti:me (.) but you know (.) for as long as - we
8 li:ve in a peaceful and harmonious society (.) it doesn't matter .hhh you know (.)
9 you can be a Malay or a Chinese (.) or an Indian but as long as you believe that
10 you are you are a Malaysian. =
- 11 FI: =Let me then just a:sk you. Are you a Malay first and a Malaysian second?
- 12 NR: Well technically – technically (.) if we talk about the constitution (.) I am a
13 Malay (.) but I'm comfortable hhh - being a Malay in a Malaysian society (.)
14 and I want us towards becoming a truly one Malaysia society. But I am proud
15 to be a Malay (.) I am proud to be a Muslim (.) hhh but the fact that I am proud
16 to be a Malay and a Muslim (.) it doesn't mean that I cannot uh rela:te to
17 others (?)

Since the first question has a racial reference, NR is giving a safe answer by not providing any confirmation on whether or not Malaysia will one day be liberated of race-based politics or provides explanation on what may hinder the government to be free of race-based politics; his response to this question indicated that NR flouted the maxim of Quantity. Moreover, his responses may also suggest that the government may have not thought of getting rid of race-based politics and he keeps on highlighting national unity in Lines 7 until 10. The clause *it doesn't matter* (Line 8) may infer that race-based politics is not of his major concern as long as Malaysians are living harmoniously irrespective of race in this country. The use of the pronoun *we* as a Malaysian (audience-inclusive *we*) in his response shows that NR is identifying himself as one of the Malaysians since he is speaking and expressing his concern as a Malaysian.

Whereas the second question posed to NR is very straightforward, FI wanted NR to confirm whether he is a Malay first and a Malaysian second or vice versa. In reply to the question, please note that there is a shift in participation status from using the pronoun

we as a Malaysian, to the use of the pronoun *I* as self-assertion (Lines 12 to 17). Instead of stating whether he is a Malay first or a Malaysian second, he went on emphasizing that he is a Malay and comfortable of being a Malay in a Malaysian society through the use of the pronoun *I* as a self-assertion in order to assert that he wants ‘us’, as in the Malaysian people, to truly become a 1Malaysia society. This shows that his responses obviously do not match the question that was asked. Rather than focusing on whether he is a Malay first or a Malaysian second, NR shifted the focus of the discourse on the idea of living in a peace and harmonious society, which he believes is more important than making it an issue about being a Malaysian first or second. As a consequence, NR actually flouted the maxim of Manner.

The use of the pronoun *I* with the word ‘think’ in *And and I and I think it’s (0.2) it might take a bit of time (,)* (Lines 6 and 7), is an indication that NR is showing uncertainties as he did not know the precise amount of time that the government require to get rid of race-based politics. The use of *I think* is also as a way for him to secure his side and be safe. Meanwhile the indication of pauses and hesitation in between his utterances shows that he is in need of words and thoughts in order to formulate the best reply in response to the questions. In fact, these were the elements that lead to the non-observance of Grice’s maxims.

2NR Extract 7

- 1 FI: However (,) there is this lar::ge group of Malays who fee:l that with you (,) pushing that (,) they do: feel that the special privileges - that their rights (?)
2 maybe trampled (.)
3 NR: I have never said (,) I'm going to change the constitution. I have never said (,)
4 that (,) I said 1Malaysia is predicated on the constitution of Malaysia (,) .hhh and
5 the constitution huh you know (,) has permission to protect Mala:y special rights
6 hhh and those things will be in the constitution.=
7 FI: =but some people had said (,) that it i:s that statement (,) in the constitution
8 .hhh that is the basis for the social racial problems that - are in Malaysia today
9 (?) that makes the Chinese (,) the Indians feel side-line.
10 NR: No I think it's the way you implement things (,) hhh and if you implement things
11 in a fairer way (,) .hhh you can reach out (,) huh you know to the Mala::ys (,) to
12 the non-Malays as well and don't forget when we implemented .hhh (0.2) the
13 new economic policy back in the 70s and 80s (,) and even (,) even in the 90s
14 before the Asian financial crisis (,) hhh it coincided with huh with huh you know
15 the growth rates of Malaysia (,) being a breakneck - speed. You know 89 % was
16 the no::rm those days. .Hhh so (,) so: new economic policy, affirmative action
17 has never really hampered (,) huh you know the growth - of Malaysia (,) into
18 into a more modern economic. =
19

The phrase *that statement in the constitution* in Line 8 uttered by FI refers to Article 153 of the Constitution of Malaysia which stated that Yang Di-Pertuan Agong Malaysia (The King of Malaysia) holds the responsibility of protecting the 'special position' of the Malays and the indigenous people of Sabah and Sarawak.

Since the use of the pronoun *I* is central to presentation of 'self', NR uses the pronoun *I* as a self-clarification to help him explain and confirms that he has never made such claims from the phrase *I have never said that* (Lines 4 and 5) and suggests that his statements may have been misinterpreted by some parties. NR also uses *I* as a self-expression to express his beliefs (Lines 11 and 12), that it all depends on fair implementation of policies and actions taken by the government, which is far more important because what is in the constitution will remain as it is, regardless of the implementation of the 1Malaysia concept. NR's response shows that he flouted the maxim of Quantity since he did not provide sufficient information to help clarify the issue concerning the special privileges and how it is said to be one of the roots to racial problems in Malaysia.

Subsequently, there is a shift in participation status when NR uses the pronoun *we* as a member of BN (audience-exclusive *we*) which suggests that he is identifying himself as one of the members. NR then relates the issue to the implementation of NEP in the 70s, 80s and 90s by BN to provide proof that the implementation had contributed to many positive outcomes instead of negative outcomes to the growth of Malaysia's economy and able to sustain racial stability. The NEP has played a big part in national Unity where there is an increased movement of different ethnic groups into many sectors including the business sector. It somehow seems like NR is trying to bring the audiences' attention onto another issue instead of just focusing and clarifying on the policies that are deemed 'unfair' as it makes the Chinese and Indians feel left out.

There are also the occurrences of the word *you know* which functions as interpersonal markers (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015), used by NR to indicate his shared knowledge about the implementation of NEP following the racial riots in 1969 and how it has successfully enhanced the economic growth of all races that he presented in the interview. At the same time, NR also wants FI and the overhearing audiences to make inferences based on what he said and to confirm FI's and the overhearing audiences' understanding about the issue.

2NR Extract 9

- 1 FI: =I want to go back and talk about the NAM (.) which you: are trying to
2 implement to try to attract more foreign investments in Malaysia (.) to make
3 Malaysia a more: (.) globally competitive economy (.) .hhh but many financial
4 analysts have been - rather lukewarm in their response to your recent outline (.)
5 and they are actually pointing to hhh huh mo:re deep seated problems (.) like the
6 a percei:ve lack of judicial independence in a country (.) hhh a seemingly
7 grow:ing rise in Islamic fundamentalism hhh and um and they also point to the
8 fact that (.) – In 2008 (.) you are at 47 (.) .hhh in 2009 (.) you find yourself at 56.
9 How do you chan:ge these perceptions?
- 10 NR: Metaphorically I've described this (0.3) hhuh like the side of a house (.) you
11 know you have the roof (.) which is - the overarching philosophy 1Malaysia (.)
12 people first (.) performance now. .Hhh then you have two pillars (.) one is the -
13 government transformation program and one for economic transformation
14 programs (.) and you have the floor which is the 10th and 11th Malaysian huh
15 pla:ns. So - the government transformation program (.) is desi:gned to - address
16 one of the - issues (.) corruption to reduce huh corruption (.) and and reduce the
17 crime rate in Malaysia (.) plus the other (.) you know six (.) all together huh six
18 key: result areas. So we we've recognized this (.) and and this is work in
19 progress. Hhuh it's too early but its work in progress (.) but I'm generally quite
20 happy hhh with the progress thus fa:r.

FI raised the issue of the Non Aligned Movement (NAM) which NR is trying to implement in his attempt to attract foreign investors to Malaysia, and several issues that could affect the implementation of NAM, for instance, the lukewarm response by financial analysts on the lack of judicial independence in Malaysia, the growing Islamic fundamentalism as well as the rising rate of corruptions. In response to the question, NR uses the pronoun *I* as a self-expression to express how he views the problem and how he believes that one of the programs he introduced in his administration, which is the government transformation program, will act as a tool to address these issues that the country is facing (Line 10).

Note that there is a shift in NR's participation status from the use of the personal pronoun *I* as self-expression to the use of the personal pronoun *we* as a member of BN, and NR mostly uses the pronoun *we* as a member of BN to suggest that he is also speaking on behalf of his party (audience-exclusive *we*). He asserted that they acknowledge the problems and they are continuously working towards improving it,

which suggests their high degree of involvement in improving the condition and early preparations towards solving the issues. Despite the description raised by FI which reflects Malaysia negatively, in his response, NR seems optimistic as he conveys his personal opinions and beliefs on how the continuous actions taken and implemented by the government are beginning to show progress despite the issues taking place in the country.

Through the use of the personal pronoun *I* found in his responses, this suggests that as a Prime Minister, he is aware of the problems happening in Malaysia and he is prepared to deal with the possible problems that could arise in the future, which is through the government programs he proposed and developed under his administration and policies. However, instead of directly enlightening what he would do to change the foreign investors' perceptions about Malaysia, NR shifts the focus of discussion to one of the government's programs and how the program will help to address the issues. This demonstrates that NR flouted the maxim of Manner by being ambiguous and maxim of Relation by providing information that is not relevant to the questions asked.

2NR Extract 10

- 1 FI: While you're implementing (.) the NAM to try to attract huh foreign investors (.)
2 and to try to boost their confidence in Malaysia (.) .hhh the wo:rl'd is also
3 watching very closely (.) the trial of Anwar Ibrahim. How do you think this trial
4 is affecting Malaysia on the international stage?
- 5 NR: Well I think we have to (0.3) we have to make people understand (.) that this is
6 not - the Malaysian government against Anwar Ibrahim ok. This is not a political
7 trial (.) it's about a you::ng - intern well not intern, young officer (.) chosen by
8 him (.) in his office (.) a 23 year old hhh huh ma::n who feel very aggrieved (.)
9 made a police repo:rt (.) against his employer (.) and that was the the genesis of -
10 the present case (?) it's got nothing to do with the government. If that - per:son
11 (.) do not make a police report (.) there will be no case against hhh Anwar
12 Ibrahim (.) so =
- 13 FI: =but you you can't get away from the fact that this is the second time (.) Anwar
14 Ibrahim [is going to court and it seems like it is being compared to the previous
15 case]
- 16 NR: [I know it should not - be shouldn't be compared] because this is the message
17 we're telling (.) ok it's not the same as the fir:st trial. This i:s an individual (.) in
18 his own office (.) appointed by him - who has felt very strongly - that he has
19 been (0.3) made to do certain things (.) that we found totally unacceptable (.)
20 made a police report (.) hhh and and investigation was launched (.) and as u
21 know under law (.) whether it is - Saiful (.) or it is Anwar Ibrahim (.) hhh
22 everybody has the same right (.) under the law. =
- 23 FI: = So do you think the first case is political?
- 24 NR: I don't think it was political (.) the first case (.) but - there was a - maybe lack of
25 () evidence (.) and I think this case I wouldn't like to comment on it (.)
26 because it is - it will be considered - sub judice (.) but huh we want it to be a fair
27 process (.) we want to be transparent (.) and huh you know the Malaysian
28 government know:s that at the end of the day (.) hhh we're gonna be judged huh
29 international is one thing (.) but the people in Malaysia huh will judge us (.) so::
30 we've realized that

The issues discussed in this extract are concerned with the trial against Anwar Ibrahim, the leader of the opposition party, PR and the leading figure of PKR. On September 20th, 1998, Anwar Ibrahim was charged for sexual misconduct and corruption and was sentenced to nine years imprisonment. In 2008, he faced a second sodomy trial initiated by his former aide, Muhammad Saiful Bukhari Azlan who claimed that h Anwar Ibrahim had forced him to commit in a homosexual conduct at a condominium in Damasara, Kuala Lumpur. Curious of how the trial has affected Malaysia at the international level, FI asked NR to share his views about the impact of the trial, if there is any.

In response to the question, NR did not comment on how the trial has affected Malaysia internationally, however, he stressed that the first and second trial was not political and not related to the government. His response suggests that it is a personal case of an individual who has the rights under the law to file a police report. NR presents the issues as collective using the pronoun *we* as the member of the government or the ruling party, BN (audience-exclusive *we*) and shift his participation status to using the pronoun *I* as self-expression (Line 5) as he stresses that the sodomy trials are not related to the Malaysian government in any way. Even though NR offered some information required to clarify the issue, his responses suggest that he is avoiding from commenting on the case because in the end the government will be judged by the people not just in Malaysia, but internationally too.

Based on his responses, this shows that NR flouted the maxim of Quantity for giving less information about the case and refusing to share his views about the matter. NR declines to discuss or comment about it because he claims that they wanted a fair and transparent process and leaving it to the judiciary to decide instead of discussing the issues as they are still under investigation. The possible reasons for doing so might be because NR wanted to avoid audiences' misunderstanding about the issue, and protect the government's positive image and credibility.

1AI Extract 1

- 1 JA: Anwar Ibrahim (,) you were a student activist (1.2) .hhh um: from your early days
2 within Malaysia (,) and you're in prison .hhh as a young man (,) can you can you
3 tell me a little about (0.8) your big political progression is over this time ?
- 4 AI: I mean I was arrested for supporting:: um - land um - farmers in the north (1.2)
5 um: demanding um some um:: treatment (,) fairer treatment from the government
6 (,) 2 years (,) um in detention (,) without trial. There was internal security act (,)
7 but huh later (,) when Mahathir became Prime Minister (,) he: came u::m with a
8 mission (,) clearly as a reformer and I was: frankly attracted to that. We've had a
9 series of discussions, and I joined (,) on this um reformed platform (,) and um
10 came up with fast (1.3) to become Deputy Prime Minister (,) only to be (0.6) sent
11 back (1.0) for (1.1) um six years imprisonment.

In this extract, AI has straightforwardly answered the question by giving a brief explanation on his political progression since he was a student activist in the University of Malaya, followed by the time he entered politics and until he was removed from the government.

AI seems to be frequently using the pronoun *I* as self-assertion (Lines 4, 8 and 9) which helps to bring the audiences' attention on him. He informs the people about his personal experience, including what he has went through since he first began his duty as a politician right after Mahathir Mohamed became the Prime Minister. Anwar Ibrahim first started his political career when he joined UMNO which was led by Mahathir Mohamed. His first appointment in the office was in 1983, as the Minister of Youth, Culture and Sports; followed by Minister of Agriculture and Agro-based Industry in 1984; Minister of Education in 1986; Minister of Finance in 1991; and Deputy Prime Minister in 1993. In early 1997, Mahathir went on a two-month holiday and had appointed AI as the 'acting' Prime Minister until he returns to the office. However, the relationship between Mahathir Mohamad and AI worsen towards the end of 1990s when Mahathir found out that AI had taken drastic steps in dealing with the financial crisis in 1997, which were against Mahathir's policies in governance. Mahathir then removed and dropped AI from the cabinet in 1998.

Notice that there is a shift in AI's participation status from the use of the pronoun *I* as self-assertion to the use of the pronoun *we* by AI to refer to him and Mahathir (audience-exclusive *we*) in Line 8, AI's response suggests that he and Mahathir had become close because both of them are attracted to the idea of reform. Although AI did not mention in detail what had happened between them and what had caused him to be sent to jail for six years, his response on his relationship with Mahathir clearly suggests that something had taken place in the past which had affected his political career over the years. Yet, he did not elaborate.

However, based on his responses, it shows that AI adhered to the four maxims as his reply to the main question asked by JA mostly using the personal pronoun *I* to talk about his political progression. When AI mentioned that he was once arrested for supporting land farmers in the north as he demands for a fairer treatment from the government to end up being in detention for two years. He mentioned that he was sent to imprisonment for six years. This somehow portrays the government in a negative light; but simultaneously reflects him as a brave young man who is willing to do it on behalf of the people who really need it.

1AI Extract 2

- 1 JA: Under Mahathir (,) there are (,) a number of people who came up to the position of
2 being Deputy Prime Minister (,) and .hhh were cast out one by one and (0.7) but (,
3) (,) huh was: the most dramatic. Can you tell me what happened?
- 4 AI: I was of course badly assaulted - of the first day I was: um (1.4) the – um: send to -
5 the police (,) custody (,) I was sent then um to solitary confinement (,) in prison. It
6 was: of course not a bed of roses (,) it was tough (,) initially (,) I was not even
7 given books to read (,) but huh the international media (,) and friends (,)
8 internationally did (,) voiced out - and I think they finally they did concede (?) and
9 allowed books and I thought I um: become slightly smarter (,) Being able to read
10 um - complete works of Shakespeare (0.6) four and a half times - that's rare, all the
11 classics (,) () you re-read them in prison (,) an:d it is interesting. From the prison
12 (,) of prison world (,) you - you understand (,) you appreciate better. There was no
13 interruption (,) you um: you immerse yourself in the story line. Sometimes it's a bit
14 depressing (,) of course (,) um:: you know (,) I have been looking at the walls (,)
15 but you keep - you keep - you know - you you you you become part (,) um - player.
16 You you you - I have never um:: internalised or appreciated the the King Lear (,)
17 one you know (,) huh the dialogue huh with Cordelior (,) you know – un:til you um
18 - ended in solitary confinement.

In response to the question, JA wanted to know what had happened between AI and Mahathir because among the people who came up to the position as Deputy Prime Minister, AI had moved up the political ranks quite fast to assume the position. AI was arrested on September 20th, 1998 as he was accused of corruption and charged for committing adultery, an act which was against the Islamic teachings.

Based on the responses given by AI, most of the use of the pronoun *I* in AI's response is used as self-assertion which allows him to share his personal experience being in prison. There are also words that are associated with the pronoun *I* to reflect the unpleasant experience that he had to go through, for instance, *badly assaulted* (Line 4), *solitary confinement* (Line 5), *not given books* (Line 7); in which all of these points were used by AI help to reveal the worst part of his life as a prisoner.

Nevertheless, instead of talking about what had happened between him and Mahathir as asked by JA, AI talked about how he spent his time in the prison. Although the use of *I* has helped him to share his experience being in prison, his responses indicate that he has flouted the maxims of Quantity and Relation for his failure to provide necessary

information to the question asked by JA. AI may have failed to observe these maxims as he wanted to expose to the public what it is like to be in prison, which at the same time portrays Mahathir and the government negatively.

There are the occurrences of the interpersonal marker *you know* (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015) which help AI to confirm JA's understanding who was also alleged of unlawful coercion and continues being under preliminary investigation which will only expire in 2020.

University of Malaya

1AI Extract 4

- 1 JA: And while inside (,) outside (,) your wife is - pushing forward a big campaign (,)
2 for your release (,) Did you did you have any [idea how] -
3 AI: [Yes].
4 JA: how big this - movement was that she had created (,) while you was inside?
5 AI: [Yes]. Not really (,) but um from the whisperings of the um (0.7) and and the
6 missives huh from the guard (,) who sometimes let us smuggle in (?) and then
7 realized that some of the prison officers would tell me - “I attended the rally about
8 10 miles of Kuala Lumpur and then um we heard your wife and her speeches” (,)
9 and then I said “how many attended?” and they said “at least 20 000 people”. So I
10 thought that there is something - something real (?) happening in the Kuala
11 Lumpur (,) .hhh and I could of course sense (?) that (,) because the day (,) I was
12 arrested there was a rally (,) for the first time - the biggest (,) ever rally in the
13 history of Malaysia (?) a hundred thousand people (,) in Dataran Merdeka. I felt
14 greatly encouraged (,) in terms of news (,) from the prison guards. They would tell
15 me that they were there (,) and many of them are on the quiet become members of
16 the party.
17 JA: .hhh and - and - did you have (,) a sense (,) of being part - of Malaysian history (,)
18 of - of .hhh being part of something bigger than yourself (?) when you heard about
19 this protest outside (,) and the - the movement .hhh um surrounding trying to get
20 you out?
21 AI: You trust the wisdom of the masses (,) how is it that you can gather one hundred
22 thousand people (,) without the sophistication (,) without media access (,) but could
23 still (,) reflect based on the dictates of their conscious - or the habits of the hearts?
24 JA: How did you get out (?) in the end? When you - while you were released from the
25 prison (,) what were you finding?
26 AI: In this case (,) what happened was (,) they persuaded the federal court - to suggest
27 that well (,) we do believe that Anwar may:be guilty (?) but (,) there was no clear
28 evidence and therefore (,) um: his appeal - is accepted.

In this extract, JA posed a series of questions about the campaign and the movement that was created by AI's wife in order to express disapproval towards the imprisonment of AI as a result of the sodomy accusation that was charged against him. On September 23rd, 1998, three days after AI was arrested, AI's wife, Wan Azizah Wan Ismail called out a rally which was held at night on the borders of Kuala Lumpur, to demand for AI's release. The rally was organised by PAS, the Islamic opposition party.

In this extract, AI uses the pronoun *I* as self-expression (Lines 9 to 13) as he recalled the series of events that had taken place on that day and expressed how he felt towards the support shown by Malaysians. In his response, AI claimed that he had never expected to receive support from such a huge crowd despite the limited airtime given to the

opposition and other limitations in getting their message out to the public. AI's responses suggest that despite the severity of the trial and treatment that indicted against him, there are still people who stood up for him, making clear of their disapproval of the governments' action. According to AI, he was greatly encouraged by the support from the people in these rallies and the movement held by his wife. AI also claimed that the prison officers quietly became members of the opposition suggesting that they were on his side. Coincidentally, it portrays the good relationship he had with the prison officers. AI claimed that he was extremely surprised by the support he was still receiving from the missives, which also suggests that he still has place in Malaysians' heart.

In response to JA's question regarding his release, AI's responses suggest that the government does not have solid evidence to further detain him for the previous allegations brought against him. This implies that he was not guilty and there are flaws within the judiciary system. When he was asked whether he had ever expected to be a part of the Malaysian history based on the support he received from the crowd in the rallies and movement, AI did not respond with a clear yes or no. Instead, his responses suggest that the support he received from the crowd proves how powerful the people can be and this should not be underestimated because despite the limitations of media access on the opposition's side, they still have their supporters.

In his replies, AI also uses positive words to express his feelings about the movement led by his wife demanding for his release, for instance, the words/phrases: *greatly encouraged, trust the wisdom of the masses*. From these words/phrases used, AI's responses suggest that he always believes that the people of a country are so powerful and they play a significant role in politics and it shows how much he appreciates the effort shown by his supporters. These words/phrases will help him to win the hearts of the audience and gain their trust. Based on AI's responses to the questions posed by JA, it shows that AI adhered to the four conversational maxims.

1AI Extract 5

- 1 JA: So you come back into Malaysia (.) an:d um (1.1) lead up to to 2008 an
2 extraordinary year um - in Malaysian politics. You try and get into um - you're
3 trying to get elected to Parliament (.) what - what happened (.) during that year?
- 4 AI: Um: we went (0.2) we worked very hard. You know (,) we don't have any access
5 to the media (,) the entire media was created - to support the ruling party (.) and -
6 and even today (,) as the leader of opposition (,) I don't even have one minute of
7 airtime (-) that's why I decided to (1.5) accepted your invitation. Can you imagine
8 (?) not a minute of airtime (?) who could still win - five states including Kuala
9 Lumpur (,) we won ten out of eleven (,) parliamentary seats? So (,) I believe (,) we
10 are - a right for it, some sort of Malaysia spring (,) through the electoral process (.)
11 um - .hhh but we worked very hard as you said in 2007(,) 2008 (,) and we did
12 worked - um har:der (,) among the ethnic minorities (,) because we found that from
13 1999 (,) to 2004 (,) they were a bit apprehensive because the policy - they thought
14 it just a matter um - of struggle among the Malay leaders - um:: supporting same
15 policies (.) and I said to the contrary (,) we are a reformed party (.) committed to a
16 reform agenda (.) some of the obsolete (,) policies (,) race-based (,) um - has to
17 change (?) with the times.

After he was released from prison for being charged of corruption and sodomy, AI returned to Parliament on April 29th, 2008 as a Member of Parliament (MP) for Permatang Pauh, Penang. In this extract, JA posed a question asking AI about his political progress as he tried to get elected into the Parliament right after his release from the prison.

Using the pronoun *we* as a member of PR (audience-exclusive *we*) shows that he is speaking on behalf of the members of his party. AI's responses exposed how the opposition members were not given any chances of access to the media. The possible reason for it is probably because the media in Malaysia is controlled by the government as they operate with a government license except for some newspapers and the Internet. AI shared how the opposition worked tremendously hard as a team in getting their message out to the public via whatever means that they possibly could, for instance, the interview session with JA.

Despite not getting a chance of airtime, AI highlighted that the opposition managed to win majority of the seats, which is ten out of eleven seats in the Parliament and successfully conquered five states including Kuala Lumpur right after his comeback in

politics, which show that the opposition has started to gain support from the public. The pronoun *we* has helped AI to share the oppositions' progress in Malaysia's politics as a team, especially after AI has returned and led the party which has helped him to address the main question asked in the interview and shows that he adhered to the four maxims of cooperative principle. The use of *we* also helps AI to portray his party as a dynamic party and very dedicated in spreading their policies which does not only offer benefit to the Malay people, but also among other ethnic minorities. AI's responses suggest that as a leader of the opposition, he is very committed to reform agenda and feels that Malaysia needs serious improvements in terms of governance especially in getting rid of the race-based politics and he believes that PR is capable of improving Malaysia towards the better.

As he was sharing his views about the issue, notice that there is a shift in his participation status from the use of the pronoun *we* as a member of PR to the use of the pronoun *I* as self-assertion (Lines 6 and 7) which enables AI to stress on how the opposition struggled without getting even a minute of airtime unlike the pro-government party, but at the same time the responses he gave have led him to portray the ruling party as biased and unfair. While the use of the pronoun *I* in Line 9 and Line 15 helps AI to support his argument and express his views about PR's potential to govern and bring in the idea of reformation; especially based on the support that the opposition party has received from Malaysians. AI's responses suggest that he is very optimistic that PR has the potential to govern Malaysia and will win the heart of Malaysians and slowly gain their trust. AI took the chance to signal that there are flaws in the current administration system and wanted to prove that GE 13 is not just a fight among Malay leaders who support the same policies or agenda, but a platform for them to make necessary adjustments and improvements in governance. Based on his responses, it shows that AI managed to give response within the topic of discussion,

thus showing that he adhered to the four conversational maxims using the personal pronouns *I* and *we*.

University of Malaya

1AI Extract 8

- 1 JA: Let let us talk (.) a little bit about Prime Minister, Najib (.) and the ruling clique.
2 When I was in Malaysia in 2009 (.) and was very (.) briefly detained by special
3 () police, they are – after, after – attending election (.) um the the the people I
4 was speaking to - um - were saying “whatever you do, don’t mention this
5 Altantuya murder”. This is the murder of the Mongolian beauty (.) who was - body
6 was blown up um with c4 explosives (.) and who was alleged for being (.) um -
7 Najib, now - current Prime Minister’s lover (.) and - my response to this was (1.0)
8 “well, why not? Well because as soon as you do, if we ever do this at a rally, the –
9 the police, turn up and they will start arresting everyone” (.) which I thought was a
10 great opportunity (.) because whenever you want to have a lot of police (.)
11 somewhere, you have a button you can press (.) at your time and place of choosing
12 to get them there. But (.) can - can you describe this murder case and why is it still
13 - so sensitive in Malaysia?
- 14 AI: It should not be sensitive. I - I’ve brought this up in the - in Parliament (.) and:
15 um: of course um: the: the speaker or the: members of the ruling (.) parties would
16 be very upset (.) I did not in any way infer (.) that Najib was even complicit (.) to
17 the murder. What we said was there were there was major questions (.) unresolved.
18 Number one- why did you change the judge? Number two - why was there no
19 proper investigations? Number three - why were the key people was not call as the
20 witnesses of the case? I - I mean – major issues and this case, the murder of
21 Altantuya (.) is related to major corruption scandal (.) involving the purchase of
22 () of two submarines from France. Then the case is now in the Paris courts.
23 How is it can be heard and open up in a Paris court (?) and we are completely
24 silent about that?
- 25 JA: In Malaysia’s - Malaysia’s testimony (.) about the number of witnesses in this
26 case was secret for some reason.
- 27 AI: Yes (.) secret – and – and worse (?)

In this extract, JA talked about the most controversial issue that had taken place in Malaysia, which is the murder case of Altantuya Shaariibuu who was believed to be murdered and her body was blown up with C-4 explosives on October 18th, 2006 at an abandoned place located in Shah Alam, Selangor. Altantuya is a Mongolian who worked as a translator. She had reportedly travelled to Malaysia a few times, and the latest was in 2006. Her murder has received international media attention as it was said to be closely associated with the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Najib Razak. Altantuya had worked as a translator during a negotiation to purchase submarines for the Malaysian government which took place in France, and she was reportedly accompanied by Abdul Razak Baginda, a Malaysian political analyst, for the negotiation session.

Based on the discussion in this extract, JA's revealed one of his experiences when he was in Malaysia that he used to be warned not to mention anything related to the murder of Altantuya. Therefore, JA would like AI to share about the murder case and the reasons that made this case a very sensitive issue in Malaysia. The use of the pronoun *I* as self-assertion in Lines 14 and 16 enables AI to highlight on some of his experiences with the audience and agreed on the incident that JA's has to deal with, because he had faced the same scenario when he brought up the issue in the Parliament demanding for clarification over a number of unresolved questions from the members of the government in the Parliament meeting. Note that there is a shift in AI's participation framework, participation status and footing from the use of the personal pronoun *I* as self-assertion to the use of the pronoun *we* as a member of PR (audience-exclusive *we*) to speak on behalf of the members of his party when he mentioned that they are expecting that the ruling party will answer the unresolved issues related to the murder of Altantuya Shaariibuu.

AI believed that the government should not be sensitive about the case as he never inferred that Prime Minister Najib was involved; but, as an individual he presented his points to express his interest and curiosity about the unresolved questions related to the murder case and feels that Malaysians have the rights to know about it too.

Although he is just trying to express his concern about the unresolved questions and how the members of the government avoided discussing about it in the Parliament, his responses suggest that there is something going on the government side from the way the issue was dealt with. AI's responses regarding the case suggest that the silence among the members of the ruling party indicates that the government is obligated to give an explanation to Malaysians concerning the Altantuya's murder case as there are still major unresolved matters which had not been clarified. Using mostly the personal pronoun *I* to describe about the murder of Altantuya Shaariibuu in response to the

questions asked by JA, it shows that AI complied with the four conversational maxims as he described the case and presented some important points that help JA and the overhearing audience to make their own inferences about the discussed matter.

University of Malaya

1AI Extract 9

- 1 JA: In 2008 (,) around the time of the election in Malaysia (,) you suffered a second (,)
2 accusation of sodomy (,) um: both brought by one of your ().
3 AI: Well this is mere complot (,) went on about the sodomy charge (,) and every
4 village (,) they played this video - um about the so called statement from the
5 complainant (,) but (,) again (,) as I said earlier (,) you know, don't underestimate
6 the wisdom of the people. You have the entire cabinet (,) the entire government
7 resources (,) every night in the national media (,) abusing me and still (,) I increase
8 my majority (,) but worse (,) is to use this as political ploy (,) trumped up charges
9 (,) use the police (,) and finally even the judiciary (,) although finally Julian (,) I
10 was acquitted (,) but never suggest that the judiciary was independent (,) right
11 through -they could just entertain (,) and allow the prosecutions just to abuse (,)
12 Disgusting (?) you know when you use this () (,) democracy (,) democratic
13 elections (,) judicial independence (,) and you abuse the process. (2.1) I'm sorry I
14 sound a bit strong in this case.

In this extract, JA raised the issue about AI's second sodomy accusation. In response to JA's question, AI described and presented some points about the case. The case took place on June 28th, 2008, whereby Muhammad Saiful Bukhari Azlan, AI's former assistant lodged a police report and alleged that he was sodomised by AI at a condominium in Damasara, Kuala Lumpur. The report was filed two days after the incident. AI, however, claimed that the report was a false and baseless accusation and immediately filed a defamation suit against Saiful on June 30th, 2008. After a series of appeal, on February 10th, 2015, the Federal Court of Malaysia sentenced AI to five-year imprisonment. This also means the end of AI's position in the Parliament, as MP of Permatang Pauh, Penang, and his position as the leader of the opposition party.

Upon discussing the issue, AI has frequently used the pronoun *I* as self-assertion which enables him to strongly express his resentment of the case and how it went viral, in which he regarded as a 'complot' plotted by another party to tarnish his image and reputation and end his political career, which in turn shows that he flouted the maxim of Quality for giving such claims without supporting it with any valid evidence. Throughout the discussion between him and JA, AI's replies suggest that the government was using the entire media to portray him negatively to the public, in an

attempt to smear his image as a Muslim leader who was apparently involved in improper activities knowing that he had no chance to defend himself since he was not given a chance of airtime. However, according to AI, despite their attempt to do so, he gained more support from his fellow supporters, instead of losing followers. AI raised some of the negative attributes concerning the ruling party and claimed that the pro-government party was in control of the authorities for instance the judiciary system. In Line 10 to Line 12, AI uses the pronoun *I* to express his disapproval towards the judiciary; *I was acquitted (.) but never suggest that the judiciary was independent (.) right through -they could just entertain (,) and allow the prosecutions just to abuse (.) Disgusting (?)* suggesting that although the government claimed that the judiciary was independent, AI however refused to agree and stated that the higher authorities were abusing the process in order to benefit their side and serve the purpose of their political agenda in an attempt to sustain their power in the government.

Next, AI believed that the ruling party is just using ‘democracy’ to convince and persuade the public and gain the public’s support. His response also suggests that the judiciary is not as fair as what the government claims them to be. In his replies, AI uses the pronoun *I* in association with words/phrases that reflects positivity on his side, for instance: *I increase my majority* and *I was acquitted* to suggest that despite the charges that were brought against him, it is proven that he is not guilty and that more people start to realize this and choose to be on his side. There is also the occurrence of the discourse marker *you know* which helps AI to mark shared or expected knowledge with JA when he re-emphasizes that the government should not underestimate the power of the people. Therefore, based on AI’s responses using mostly the pronoun *I* in this sense, shows that AI flouted the maxim of Quantity as he provided more information than what is required about the case, especially when he portrayed the government negatively as he presented his points and views on the side of the opposition.

2AI Extract 2

- 1 RC: Let us talk about a little bit about the situation in your country Sir. Maybe a year
2 and half ago or so - there seems to be a lot of omen (,) to be on the side of the
3 opposition where you had um: .hhh pretty good numbers in the election. But um:
4 - always seen to be having a - trouble holding it back together. Today (,) we look
5 at the situation (,) and and you are going to be to court again (,) they have gotten
6 these charges (,) against you again (,) um (0.8) has the momentum somehow
7 slowdown (,) a little bit? Has it been a set aback (,) like what you said?
- 8 AI: Yes (,) um because (,) um the height of our um - for example popularity then,
9 there was a change in leadership (,) and then um the people said “ok, now give
10 this new guy a chance” and then the new leader comes () (,) and um with
11 attractive pronouncement (,) so on and reform (,) and um saying “I will work, I
12 will dedicate myself to make the changes”. So I think the first few months we
13 were: taken aback quite a bit (,) then withdrew from the scene temporarily. But I
14 was convinced (,) that the new Prime Minister Najib (,) will not be prepared to
15 undertake real serious reformations (,) So - now (,) after six months (,) the whole
16 thing um explode (,) there is this huge scandal involving the port - 12 billion
17 ringgit (,) and then um:: the disappearance of Jet engines (,) the fighter jet (,)
18 which is actually shocking which is um: does not even happen in Burma and
19 Zimbabwe (,) and um: so: um – um: now - um um the attack of the arson in the
20 churches (,) () Muslims (,) people see this pattern of the leadership be getting
21 desperate and using whatever means possible to retain power. And I think now
22 um we have now surged - we have seen it in our rallies. We have now come
23 back very very strong formidable (1.2) force.

In this extract, RC mentioned despite doing well in the election in Malaysia, the opposition party has always seemed to be having problems to maintain their position in politics because there are always things that seem to obstruct their progress and position, for instance, the second sodomy accusation he faced made by his former assistant, Mohammad Saiful Bukhari Azlan in 2008. Since he is often conflicted with many issues right after he was removed from the Parliament, RC would like him to share about the opposition’s progress and struggle despite the difficult times they are dealing with.

In response to RC’s question, AI uses the pronoun *I* as self-expression to express his dedication in taking his responsibility as a leader (Line 21), which infers that he will give it all to make the necessary changes and undertake serious reformation in Malaysia’s politics. AI confirmed that the opposition’s momentum has slowed down a

bit and claimed that the opposition drew out temporarily. But according to AI, it took place as a result of the change in leadership, in which he is referring to NR. Besides that, using the pronoun *I* has helped him to express his views on NR's governance, how NR is not ready to take on serious reformation. Along with this, AI raised the issue of a number of scandals involving a huge amount of money, for instance, the disappearance of the fighter jet engines. The two missing jet engines belong to the Royal Malaysian Air Force (RMAF), which worth \$15 million each, were reported to be missing from the warehouse in Sungai Besi in May 2008 and were believed to be stolen and shipped by some military officers to Uruguay. Regardless of these issues, using the pronoun *we* as a member of PR (audience-exclusive *we*) in Lines 12 and 22, AI believes that the PR coalition has come back strongly and that they are ready to face the challenges to undertake serious reformation in Malaysia's political system. The shift from the use of the pronoun *I* as self-expression to the use of the pronoun *we* as a member of PR also denotes the shift in participation status as it allows AI to construct a different identity in his responses. Although AI has answered the questions as what is required by RC, AI seems to be giving a lot of other information in order for him to support his argument and point out his views about the ruling establishments and as a result of the over information, AI flouted the maxim of Quantity. The information included in his response also portrays the ruling party, BN in a negative way, especially when he mentioned about the scandals and how he thinks that the ruling party is in desperation to retain power.

2AI Extract 3

- 1 RC: So people were saying (,) “alright alright, let’s give this guy a chance”(,) and
2 then they were waiting to see what’s happening (,) and then they are hearing all
3 these things (,) and so you’re seeing again your people - rallying towards the
4 opposition (,) Do you think to some extent that is why we are hearing things like
5 - there was a recent controversy in your country that only Muslims can use the
6 term ‘Allah’ (,) was that somehow something they were using (,) to try to um -
7 to win over - perhaps the religious and then - now they are filing charges against
8 you again (,) is this somehow part of the counter attack against um – um - what’s
9 happening now (,) as you say there seems to be declining in their popularity?
- 10 AI: Ya (,) but this desperate - move (,) is now um too clear for them (,) they are
11 public and um for example the ‘Allah’ issue is a non-issue in the last 1500 years
12 (,) since the advent of Islam. And um - no country in the world um – Indonesia
13 even has the issue becomes a problem (,) because we speak the same language
14 (,) when you translate the bible into Bahasa Indonesia (,) or Malay (,) then it
15 becomes ‘Allah’ for ‘God’. I mean it is a choice for the Christians (,) but um it
16 becomes a problem. But now (,) they started um – um conceding (,) for example
17 (,) they say “well you can do it in Sabah and Sarawak,” and now (,) another two
18 states. So it’s not a theological question. If it is a theological question (,) you
19 don’t compromise at calling to districts (,) and um - so (,) we use this now to
20 explain to the Muslim public “you can’t” (,) but then (,) what happened which is
21 more serious is the use of the government control media (,) the vernacular Malay
22 press (,) to incite Muslims’ feeling of insecurity that are being threatened (,) by
23 the Christians. Weeks later (,) or months later (,) we have this arson (,) the attack
24 on the church (,) 14 churches and 1 temple. Which now I think um - they wanted
25 to use it as a security problem (,) but um I think we have gone down to say
26 “look, it is a security () on the part of the rulings establishment”=
- 27 RC: =And this um there is a slippery slope (,) is that not everyone starting inciting
28 these things (,) um:: we know that traditionally the Malaysian divisions in
29 society are are racial (,) there are ethnic (,) there are religions (,) and this - this is
30 kind of stoking as is it now huh?
- 31 A I: Yes (,) I think they were playing with very dangerous game. We have seen um
32 in the past, the last 1969 (,) the national riots (,) and the um - but um from clear
33 evidence the groups are the society groups those who are involved in arson (,)
34 are all either associated (,) ally or members of the ruling party (,) UMNO and
35 um the more (,) is made known because um that is why when they are doing the
36 charge (,) they have arbitrated these facts(,) so clearly um - the police force (,) is
37 very complicit in this sort of um arrangement (,) and it is dangerous (,) because I
38 think you are .hhh sacrificing or threatening the peace and security of the
39 country. But I am optimistic because um unlike in the past (,) we the opposition
40 becomes really either the Muslims (,) and the you know - there is a multiracial
41 ruling coalition. Now the opposition coalition is multiracial.

The issues discussed in this extract is about the controversy over the use of the term ‘Allah’ among the non-Muslims as well as the second sodomy charge made against AI, which is deemed by AI as part of the government’s plan and desperate move to win over the public’s votes in the upcoming election since their popularity is declining in politics.

According to AI, the controversy over the use of the term ‘Allah’ is not even an issue because the term ‘Allah’ if translated in English means ‘God’ and it is just a matter of choice among the Christians. Though it is not certain whether the controversy is really a part of the ruling party’s plan, the use of the pronoun *I* as self-expression with the word ‘think’ helps AI to express his feelings to suggest that the ruling party is using the issue to create a security problem, and raise religious tensions among nations and incite Muslims’ feeling of insecurity and make the public feel threatened by the Christians since the media are fully under the control of the government, there was an attack happening at the church which includes 14 churches and 1 temple.

In January 2010, which is a few months after the controversy, a number of churches were attacked as a result of the ban on Christians using the word ‘Allah’. For instance in Taiping, the St. Louis Catholic church was hit by petrol bombs, whereas the Good Shepherd Catholic church in Miri was thrown bricks and stones by attackers and the wall of the Malacca Baptist church was smeared with black paint. Some Muslims in Malaysia argued that the use of the word ‘Allah’ by the Christians could mislead people about Muslims. AI claimed that these attacks were a part of the ruling party’s agenda to retain their power in the government.

As AI recalled back the national riot that took place in 1969 and claimed that there was clear evidence that the people involved in the riots were associated with the members of the ruling party and the police were even involved in the arrangement. According to AI, when incident like this took place, it actually threatened the peace and security of the country because it involves race and religion. Notice that there are a few shifts in the participation status from the use of the pronoun *I* as self-expression to the use of the pronoun *we* as a Malaysian and the Indonesians (audience-inclusive *we*) to indicate that both of these nations speak the same language found in Line 13; the use of the pronoun *we* as a Malaysian (audience-exclusive *we*) in Lines 23, 25 and 31, to suggest that

Malaysians have witnessed the attacks on the churches after the controversy of the use of the word 'Allah' by the Christians; and the use of the pronoun *we* as a member of PR (audience-exclusive *we*) in Line 39, to highlight that he is positive that the opposition coalition will manage to handle it well since they are now a multi-racial ruling coalition who does not only fight for the rights of ethnic majorities, but also for ethnic minorities.

With regards to the claim made by AI about the ruling party, his responses do not include any concrete evidence to prove that the controversy over the use of the term 'Allah' is a part of their opponent's political agenda. Based on AI's responses towards the issue, AI flouted the maxim of Quantity because he offers more information than that is needed by RC, and he flouted the maxim of Quality because although his claim about the ruling party may be true, he did not predicated his claim on a valid evidence to entirely blame the ruling party regarding the attack on the churches and the riots. He may have flouted the maxims to support his claim about the government and to portray the ruling party in a negative way.

2AI Extract 4

- 1 RC: How do you get your message out there? As you said there is a lot of
2 government influence over the media (,) in your country. So it must um be um -
3 difficult for you the opposition (,) I mean, I am just comparing to here (,) the
4 opposition here (,) - will have access to the media – anytime (,) It is not the same
5 (,) you know.
- 6 AI: Yes (,) it is um: tougher. We have Internet penetration of course (,) alternative
7 media (,) but it is only confined to urban (,) and sub-urban (,) selected areas - not
8 the rural areas. Then we have to use pamphlets (,) () (,) because we don't
9 have permits (,) then we have to go rallies (,) but we don't have permits (,)
10 therefore (,) the police will come (,) and take away the microphone (,) and then
11 charge you for illegal assembly (,) I had just encountered that just last week.
12 Um:: but not withstanding this um - these um - these um problems. Many
13 countries have gone through worst - um: it just takes um resolves um the
14 tenacity of purpose for us to continue (,) and move on (,) and I think the
15 advantage is that people are still prepared to listen. =
- 16 RC: = Um do you think part of it also - makes it difficult (,) I mean the fact that if
17 you compared Malaysia to the Philippines (,) you do have less poverty (,) in
18 other words (,) um:: more people in your country - probably have um the
19 material um requirements (,) um so, there is less of a reason I guess to to to
20 dissent. Does that makes it difficult as well?
- 21 AI: Yes (,) it is true (,) that um - there is a better infrastructure (,) and the standard of
22 living is better than many liberal countries (,) except for Singapore (,) and and
23 um – therefore (,) you know (,) this growing (0.9) frustration due to abject urban
24 poverty living is not there as much in Malaysia. But um I don't think we need to
25 - um underestimate the wisdom of the masses (,) they will move at the right (,)
26 time. After all you have seen the move (,) which was unprecedented which was
27 shocking to Dr Mahathir then (,) when they move about hundreds of thousands
28 into the district of Kuala Lumpur (,) So people do express (,) their views um -
29 sometimes quite strongly (,) when they feel that the system been so blatantly
30 corrupt (,) and unjust.

The mainstream media in Malaysia, for instance TV1, TV2, TV3, 8TV and Channel 9, are closely linked to the ruling party as they operates under government's license. As what is often mentioned by AI, the opposition party has no access to the media and mainly depends on alternative media such as the Internet. With Internet, they are able to reach the public via various ways, for instance, using social media such as Facebook, Twitter and blogs. In this extract, RC wanted AI to disclose how the oppositional coalition spreads their message to the public despite the limitations of airtime that they received. AI listed out several approaches that the opposition worked on other than Internet, which are via pamphlets distribution and organising rallies. However, political rallies are legally prohibited in Malaysia.

There is a shift in participation status in Line 11, when AI uses the pronoun *we* as a member of PR to the use of the pronoun *I* as self-expression to express his resentment and experience as the opposition leader, who have just been charged for illegal assembly. AI's responses infer that there were a lot of limitations to the opposition's movement in Malaysia and it seems like their activities are being closely monitored by the government authorities for instance, when there were times they were asked to stop their activities by the police because they don't have legal permit to carry out their activities. As a result of these restrictions by the government authorities, most of their activities are being hampered so that they are not able to spread their political messages, policies and ideologies to the public.

There are a lot of extra information that AI included in his response and as a result of his lengthy explanation, AI actually flouted the maxim of Quantity; although he addressed the questions asked by RC, AI seems to offer more information to support his claim and argument about the issue that is related to the government and the authorities under NR's governance. However, according to AI, he is optimistic that the people are ready and prepared to listen to the oppositional coalition. AI uses the pronoun *we* as a member of PR, and his responses suggest that as a party, they have been working very hard even though they face a lot of challenges especially from the authorities and it also helps AI to express his views and present the details of their effort and plan of governance to undertake serious reformation.

2AI Extract 9

- 1 RC: People here who know you and the people who have followed you - are
2 wondering now what is going to happen to you when you get back (,) to
3 Malaysia, because I know you are facing a trial again. So what do you think is
4 going to happen?=
5 AI: =Qui sera sera. Um: (1.8) well, it is a trumped up charges (,) and as I have said,
6 it is the first time in history (,) recent history that you can - um um prefer a
7 charge with no prima facie evidence (,) um just using one person (,) enrage him
8 (0.9) and then um (1.3) say whatever to smear. But um: we have then taken um::
9 proper council um: line of defence (,) by inducing whatever evidence that we
10 have (,) medical evidence (,) to prove that these are all frivolous charges. I mean
11 it is quite known in Malaysia (,) that this is the first case where it took six
12 months to get the police report (,) I mean anywhere (,) in any case (,) you can get
13 it on the same day. And then (,) this is the first case (,) that we even can't get
14 document. Today (,) the federal court (,) rejected my application to get my
15 documents (,) to prepare for my defence. So you can understand this (). But I
16 believe that we can (2.6) not only withstand our support (,) level but then to push
17 the agenda forward an:d um - expose them. =
18 RC: = But is there a chance that you could be: thrown back in jail (,) when you get
19 back?
20 AI: Well that is of course the Najib's plan. I mean (,) Prime Minister Najib (,) his
21 wife (,) and his cronies are all deeply involved in this. The instruction that goes
22 to the police (,) and their agenda is quite known. I think it is the only way to
23 deflect from some of the serious issues (,) against him. I don't think that it is the:
24 - the right to do (,) I mean um - you face on and be civil about it (,) (). After
25 all (,) - I am the elected leader of the opposition.
26 RC: An:d how does that affect the: - momentum now (,) that is being renewed in the
27 opposition if if if they are trying to throw you back in jail?
28 AI: Well the activities (,) enthusiasm um will be further enhanced. It is not only me
29 (,) Ricky (,) you know (,) it is almost every single opposition leader - is under
30 investigation of in charged - for sedition (,) for unlawful assembly (,) for
31 corruption (,) um: not serious corruption (,) I have gone through the files - that
32 were: lead to one death remember this young - political - activist - over: two
33 thousand ringgit investigations - that lead to his death. So we have actually see
34 this problem here (,) so because of that (,) the opposition have taken the position
35 that we have to be firm (,) and tough (,) in our battle against the government (,) and
36 we have seen in the last couple of weeks - and months (,) there is a growing
37 - anger - expressed in many of the rallies.
38 RC: Well (,) we (,) um: we will eagerly wait to see what will happen to you when
39 you get back. Certainly (,) the people here - in Manila will be also monitoring
40 about developments of Anwar Ibrahim as always. Pleasure to have you again.
41 [Thank you very much.]
42 AI: [Thank you Ricky] (,) see you in Kuala Lumpur.

In response to the questions asked by RC regarding the second sodomy accusation that AI will be facing once he returns to Malaysia, most of the responses by AI portray the Malaysia's government negatively, especially NR and the members of the ruling party.

According to AI, the trial that was brought against him will not slow down the momentum of the opposition's activities in Malaysia because he believes that the trial was another political ploy by the ruling party to hamper his political career. AI uses the pronoun *we* to speak on behalf of the members of his party, as he strongly expresses his principle towards dealing with the trial and emphasizes that the opposition is committed in their battle against government. His response suggests that the oppositional members are prepared to face the challenges and they will fight against the government as a united team despite the trial that was brought against him with an attempt to weaken the opposition's position in politics. AI asserted that the opposition could sense there is a growing anger expressed in many of the rallies involving the public against the government, for instance, the Bersih rally to suggest that most Malaysians are not happy with the current government which is proven from the rallies that had taken place every now and then. Bersih (which means clean in English) is a coalition of non-governmental organisations (NGO) that demands for a clean and fairer election and seeks for improvements in the current electoral system in Malaysia. The first Bersih rally was organised on November 10th, 2007 at Dataran Merdeka, and was participated by almost 40,000 supporters.

Then, notice that there is a shift in AI's participation status indicated by the shift in the use of the pronoun *we* as a member of PR (audience-exclusive *we*) to the use of the pronoun *I* as self-assertion, which helps him to suggest that he is innocent and was just another victim to serve the purpose of the pro-government's agenda (Line 5 and 6), and helps AI to express his disagreement towards the charge that was brought against him. He strongly asserts that NR should deal with the controversies politically instead of creating another issue in order to deflect away from it. The use of the pronoun *I* as self-assertion by AI in *after all I am the elected leader of the opposition* (Lines 24 and 25) suggests that he believes that NR should not use such approach towards him and should

at least acknowledged AI as the leader of the opposition that was officially elected by the people. When AI talks about the judiciary process, he based his argument from his experience dealing with the process that took place with the court. He claimed that although there was no solid evidence to prove that he committed the offense, he is still being charged, and it even took him six months to get the police report, where normally people would be able to get the report on the same day. AI responses suggest that there are problems with the court procedure and at the same time portray the Malaysia's judiciary system negatively.

AI's overall responses include a lot of negative remarks about the current government; this over information could help RC and the overhearing audience to make inference about the action that the Malaysian government will take against AI as soon as AI returned to Malaysia. For giving too much of information than what is required, AI has flouted the maxim of Quantity and for not providing adequate and sufficient evidence about the claim he made about NR and the members of the ruling party, AI has flouted the maxim of Quality. In his responses, AI claimed that NR and his cronies were deeply involved in the plan to throw him back to jail. When AI uses *I think* to say that it was a part of NR's agenda to deflect from the controversies against him, it shows that AI is uncertain about it but he strongly felt that NR is using him to shift public attention on the controversies against him to something else, which is AI's second trial.

Overall, there are 8 extracts from DSNR's interviews and 10 extracts from DSAI's interviews on the theme of political affairs. The frequencies for the use of the personal pronoun *I* found in DSNR's responses are 39, and 53 in DSAI's responses. Whereas the frequencies for the use of the personal pronoun *we* in DSNR's responses are 23, and 38 in DSAI's responses.

4.1.2 Theme: Governance

1NR Extract 5

- 1 VP: Let me ask you Prime Minister. Um as you rai:sed the issue of Isla:m (,) huh
2 you: gave some very inspiring um speeches giving - a vision that you ha:ve for -
3 um huh (0.3) coalition of moderates around the world (,) in the united nations
4 general assembly . Can you:: tell us (,) .hhh what that vision is about and how it
5 squares with what you are doing in Malaysia?
6 NR: Malaysia is actually: huh a epitome of that you know huh even before I spoke I
7 don't want to claim huh credit for this (,) but hhh even from from our inception
8 we have always been huh in a practice. We practise Islam in a very hhh
9 moderate way in Malaysia. .hhh That's why:: basically (,) over 55 years (,) hhh
10 we have been able to successfully manage a ve::ry very complex diverse society
11 (,) in Malaysia (,) hhuh and huh that's the kind of hhuh fusion that I like to
12 project and I like other countries to come on board to support this idea (,) .hhh
13 that being huh moderate (,) being huh moderation (,) .hhh huh being balanced
14 huh rejecting extremism (,) rejecting violence (,) .hhh rejecting bigotry hhh it's
15 the only way - to secure huh you know peace and stability in this world. =

The pronoun *you* in the phrase “Let me ask *you* Prime Minister” and “Can *you* tell us...” in the extract above shows that the question was directed at him, in which he is expected to respond using the pronoun *I* in his utterances.

In the first part of his response, NR uses the pronoun *I* that can be found in the phrase “*I* don't want to claim credit for this” (Line 7) as a self-expression to express about the country's accomplishment under his administration, followed by the shift in the use of pronoun *I* to *we* in the same sentence. The use of *I* and *we* in this sentence may suggest the members of the ruling party's effort as a whole, inclusive of him as the leader of BN, have done something significant in their governance which is practising real moderation, which is why *we* are able to secure *our* place in the government for over 55 years. NR's intention in using the pronoun *I* maybe because he wanted to alert the readers that even before he spoke at the assembly, the government has already been practising moderate Islam, whereas the use of pronoun *we* and the phrase “for 55 years” help to highlight the ruling party's experience in the political field and at the same time putting his party under favourable light.

It is important to note that, the shift from *I* to *we* demonstrated by NR also indicates shifts in NR's participation status (Line 8), which allows NR to construct a different identity as he responds to the question. For instance, in the first part NR uses the pronoun *I* to refer to himself as an individual politician (Line 6), whereas in the same sentence, he shifts to using the pronoun *we* as he speaks on behalf of the ruling party and also as a Malaysian (audience-inclusive *we*) in Line 8. The pronoun *we* in this context is not only referring to *we* as a Malaysian; which helps to identify himself as one of the Malaysians, but it is more central to *we* as in the members of the ruling party, including him (audience-exclusive *we*), have done something right under his administration which have helped them to govern a multi-racial country for more than five decades. At the same time, he is also claiming credit as he speaks on behalf of the members of BN when he said *over 55 years we have been able to successfully manage a very, very complex diverse society in Malaysia* (Lines 9 to 11), to suggest that it would not be possible if it is not because of their effort and hard work to manage the country. Using the personal pronoun *we* helps NR to reflect a good self-representation of him as the Prime Minister of Malaysia, the leader of the government, and highlighting the credibility of members of the ruling party at the same time.

The use of *we* assists him not only to focus on him as the highest authority in the government, but also to make known the party's contribution in the past and present as a whole. Having used the pronoun *we* in his utterances has led him to give more information about the ruling party's past contributions, which in turn leads to the flouting of maxims, that is, the maxim of Quantity as he fails to provide sufficient information that corresponds to VP's question, as well as the maxim of Manner as he fails to provide a brief and clear answer so as to explain what is the 'moderate way' that has been practised in Malaysia, other than rejecting extremism and violence, and how it aligns with the vision that NR speaks about in the general assembly.

In the last few lines of NR's responses, he highlighted how the ruling party has been able to successfully maintain peace and racial stability in Malaysia over 55 years as a result of practising moderation in their governance and would like other countries to practise this too, and the reason why he said this could possibly be because there are other countries, with a diverse society, such as Burma, which is currently dealing with issues of ethnic cleansing of the Rohingyas people. NR's may imply that their governance is not as bad as what others might think and he may also suggest that this problem could be as a result of Burma's failures to practise moderation in their governance. The possible factors for the use of the pronoun *we* could possibly be because it helps NR to reflect a good self-representation of him as the Prime Minister of Malaysia, the leader of his party, BN and the government, and highlighting the credibility of members of the ruling party at the same time. Although the use of the pronouns *we* helps to put forward positive aspects of the Malaysia's government, it simultaneously leads to the flout of maxims of Quantity and Manner.

1NR Extract 6

- 1 VP: =Alright then let's look at Malaysia specifically (.) because there have been (0.1)
2 criticisms (.) for example of this notorious ca:se (.) which went to the court (.)
3 over the use of the word - 'Allah' in a catholic bible. .hhh Um (0.1) how does a
4 case like tha:t happening hhh in Malaysia under your: administration which
5 wants to be:: an epitome (.) of moderate Islam?
- 6 NR: .hhh Well there's a certain huh you know fundamental principles (.) that you
7 have to understand (.) because hhuh (0.2) you know when we - believe in
8 moderation .hhh huh we we shouldn't do something that - be hurtful to others.
9 You know (.) for example as a Muslim (.) I shouldn't do something that will
10 upset the Catholics and the Christians .hhh and likewise (.) Christians shouldn't
11 do something that will upset - the Muslims. There must be other way:s of doing
12 it (.) hhh there must be other solutions. .hhh So what I am trying to say (.) look
13 (.) fi:nd solutions hhh huh that will will () a:ll you know I mean Christians,
14 Hindus, Muslims so that huh whatever we do: will not you know: (.) will not
15 huh (0.2) be so sensitive will not hhh upset the feelings of others.
- 16 VP: I went to a Mass in Beirut (.) and: um they: speak in Arabic (.) they celebrated in
17 Arabic (.) and they say 'Allah' a lot and all the time (?) Why isn't it a problem
18 why is it a problem in Malaysia? =
- 19 NR: =It's a problem because huh you know the concept of 'Allah' is different (.) in a
20 Muslim sense .hhh [and then in a Christian sense
21 VP: [but then Muslims in Lebanon as well]
- 22 NR: Yes I know (.) but it's different (.) in a different in a cultural (). There is
23 different than here. So:: huh I'm just talking about hhh you know: so that we we
24 don't upset - the Muslims in Malaysia (.) Muslims don't upset the Christians in
25 Malaysia (?) .hhh and we have lived in har:mony for so:: lo::ng. Is it su::ch a big
26 issue that we can't manage?

In this extract, VP shares her experience when visiting Beirut and mentions about the use of the word 'Allah' and how it is not a problem among the Muslims and non-Muslims living there. Then, she compares it to the recent case that took place in Malaysia where there was a recent issue over the use of the word 'Allah' among the Catholics despite NR's claim on the practice of 'moderate' Islam in his governance and questions NR over the issue.

NR is mostly using the generic *we* in response to the questions asked. In the first part of his response (Lines 7 and 8), NR uses the generic *we* to refer to whoever believes in real moderation irrespective of race and religion and also stresses on how the attitude of a person who believes in moderation should be. The use of the generic *we* lead to the flouting of the maxims because the reference was not specific. The reason could

possibly be because he does not want to specifically refer to any race or religion and create more religious tensions among Malaysians; rather, he takes a safe approach using the generic *we* as it enables him to refer to the people in general.

And in the next line (Line 23), take note that there is a shift in NR's participation status based on the use of the pronoun *we* as a Malaysian to *I* as self-assertion, showing that NR is constructing a different identity as he is speaking as a Muslim and expresses his beliefs on how good Muslims should be. The use of the pronoun *I* in this sense helps NR to put forward his personal beliefs on the way he and other Muslims should act to resemble a true Muslim. Although NR manages to keep his responses relevant to the topic of discussion on the issue of the word 'Allah', the shift in NR's participation status based on the use of the pronoun *we* to *I* that is evident in his utterances has led to the flouting of the maxim of Quantity as he diverted the audiences' attention and mentioned about how Malaysians have managed to live in harmony, rather than explaining 'how' is it possible for an event like this to happen under his administration who claims to have practised moderate islam over 55 years ago.

Besides that, there is also the use of the word *I mean* in Line 13 which is marked as a reformulation marker (Hyland, 2007) which enables NR to do a restatement of his previous statement and present it in a different way to further help reinforced his intended meaning to make his utterance more comprehensible to the overhearing audiences so that his answer will not only focus on Islam but also other religion since Malaysia is a multi-racial country.

1NR Extract 7

- 1 VP: .hhh You: have lived parts of your life. We're talking about your education in -
2 the West (,) in the UK. .hhh Um in UK: though (,) you don't need to write what
3 race you belong to when you apply for [various
4 NR: [yes yes (,)]
5 VP: hhh loans and things like that. For people, it's something that people don't
6 understand. There're so many layers:: which talk about talk about race (,) we
7 talk about religion (,) and it is a very sensitive issue in Malaysia. Hhh so um do
8 you see a time when people won't be asked these questions? When it won't
9 matter? =
10 NR: =Yes (?) eventually. You see what what you know what [we believe in
11 VP: [in in in your administration?]
12 NR: We believe (,) we believe that you know you know to be (0.1) huh to have a
13 stro:ng huh and and and and prosperous Malaysia. What is important (,) is the
14 underpinning. The underpinning is social justice. Hhuh in a sense that (,) wealth
15 in this country should be distributed equitably (,) hhh between the various rac
16 .hhh because if you have hu::ge huh (0.2) divergent in wealth (,) (0.2) huh that
17 that will lead to – instability (,) political instability. Hhuh and and I can quote
18 you many examples of that. So what is important for us (,) as as we progress as a
19 nation (,) .hhh it's to ensure that the wealth of nation (,) is distributed fairly (0.2)
20 and and and social justice in country. =
21 VP: =Yeah I understand that I have a friend in media resea:rch. He said that you
22 know .hhh I: have a proclivity and I don't like to being asked that question. I
23 write - when it says ra:ce (,) I say “amazing” or “human” (,) but am I wrong?
24 They they they say no. You're making things difficult for (0.1) advertising
25 research .hhh but it's in my - it's a lot in people hea:rt that they don't think it
26 should matter.
27 NR: No (?) no (,) I know and I don't think so. And and and as you can see (,) our
28 policies are moving towards that. And for example (,) .hhh when we want to
29 help the: the poor (,) and the lowered-income group (,) it's irrespective of race.
30 You know - when we we gave the three the five hundred ringgit (,) it was said (,)
31 anyone who earn:s three thousand ringgit and below (,) (0.4) will get that you
32 know. So that's the example of huh of huh you know (,) a policy that doesn't
33 take into account hhh ethnic huh considerations at all.

The question asked by VP in this extract is another question that talked about race and religion and even highlighted how the issue is quite sensitive in Malaysia; a country that is well-known for its diverse culture.

This type of question makes it a bit difficult for NR to provide an explanation as he needs to be wary of how he expresses his opinion over the issue and not seems biased, which can be further noticed from the frequent abrupt pauses in between his utterances as well as the occurrences of the the word *you know* (Lines 10 and 12) which functions as interpersonal markers (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015) to indicate his shared

knowledge and attitude to show that he is aware that the audiences have some knowledge about BR1M. Thus, to help him provide an explanation that is safe and without mentioning specifically to any races, the use of the pronoun *we* as a Malaysian (audience-inclusive *we*) enables NR to project his opinion about the matter in a way that it is a collective response instead of his personal response. Notice that in the first part of his response, NR does not directly address the issue, but instead he expresses his opinion using the pronoun *we* as a member of the party (audience-exclusive *we*), suggests that in order to implement policies that do not take race and religion into account, he believes that he first needs to strengthen the foundation of social justice in Malaysia by ensuring that the country's wealth is being fairly distributed to all Malaysians because otherwise, it will lead to political instability which also implies racial instability. In the next few lines, there is a shift in NR's participation status to using *we* as a Nation instead of *we* as political members of BN.

Then, there is a shift in NR's participation status in Line 27, in which NR shifts from using the pronoun *we* as a Malaysian to the use of pronoun *I* as self-expression which helps NR to express his disagreement towards VP's statement about the issue of race. The use of *we* as a member of a political party helps NR to speak on behalf of the members of BN which does not only help him to establish unity with the the members of BN, but most importantly it also helps him to distance himself from taking an individual responsibility over the matter, and suggesting that the responsibility of achieving the plan as what is mentioned by VP is not on him alone, but also on other members of BN. As a result, the use of *we* as a member of BN by NR has led him to the flout of the maxim of Quantity because he gives a general answer and is playing it safe by bringing up topics about social justice, distribution of equal wealth; and the maxim of Manner for failing to provide a clear indication of the government's plan to cope with the issues of race and religion.

Although he failed to provide clear and concise answers, he managed to include an example of an approach that does not discriminate against other race or religion (refer to Lines 28 – 33) in which the government has already implemented since 2012, which is the 1Malaysia People's Aid or better known as BR1M. BR1M is a government scheme that provides financial assistance of RM 500 to households of lower income Malaysians, whose income is lower than RM 3,000. According to NR, the initiative of implementing BR1M is one of the government's efforts to ease the burden of the people, regardless of race and religion. Thus, the possible factors for the use of *we* as a Malaysian could possibly be because NR wants to show that he is representing the voice of all Malaysians and suggests that there are other important things that must be addressed before implementing a new policy. For instance, the use of the pronoun *we* with the word *believe* and *progress* helps NR to highlight his party's positive attributes and actions, by letting people know what their policies are and what are the measures that they have considered to slowly address the issue mentioned by VP.

1NR Extract 8

- 1 VP: Um but poverty is particularly ba::d in Sabah and Sarawak (,) .hhh and the
2 people there:: often complaining that they get less development (,) that you
3 know - real difficulty (,) hhh and (0.1) there very important politically (,) in this
4 election campaign. On top of that (?) there is stro:ng sense hhh of corruption - in
5 the government (,) of the state. Particularly after I'm sure you're: aware of
6 global witness hhh hhuh () 'Inside Malaysia's Secret or Shadows State'.
7 What's been done about – corruption (,) seriously?
- 8 NR: It's one of my priorities (,) in of huh my administration. As you know huh (0.2)
9 it's part of our:: huh National key result areas (,) with listed corruption (,) hhh as
10 one of the seven important areas (,) .hhh and the:: with instituted quite a number
11 of huh important changes and reforms (,) hhh to combat huh corruption. Hhuh it
12 will not huh go: away overnight. It's a process (,) but huh important steps - have
13 been undertaken. For example (,) we have the Whistleblowers' Act (,) hhh we
14 have strengthen the anti-corruption agency MACC. .hhh huh In fact, hhuh huh
15 it's part of my election - promise hhh that there would be: an independent
16 commission to: employ future officers of MACC hhh so that (,) they would be
17 able to select their own people. We have made huh government contracts more
18 transparent (,) huh we have introduced harsher punishment (,) .hhh we have
19 prosecuted five hundred cases. So so the result actually huh begin to show.
- 20 VP: What about this call for a rea:l commission of inquiry – into (,) the: corruption of
21 which the Chief Minister - accused?
- 22 NR: I'm not referring to any particular case (,) but all cases will be - investigated by
23 MACC hhh and there is a due process. We shouldn't jump to any conclusion. =
- 24 VP: =But they can't prosecute (,) can they?
- 25 NR: They can prosecute. They have power to prosecute. For prosecution – lie:s with
26 the hh Attorney General. But like every case (,) they huh must hhh do: the
27 proper investigation (,) they must have huh strong evidence (,) that can be hhh
28 brought to court.
- 29 FI: Isn't also (?) the case though that the - Minister Taib is very important politically
30 (,) that Sabah and Sarawak are crucial politically hhh for:: the elections. They
31 could be the swing vote (?).
- 32 NR: Yes (?) but no one is above the law (,) you know. It has to be: predicated on the
33 due: process.

In the beginning, VP raised the issue about poverty and poor development in Sabah and Sarawak, but specifically talked about corruption in the government. Again, this is another question that is linked to BN's reputation. Firstly, the analysis would also look at the three instances of *my* in this extract as it is also significant in the presentation of 'self', similarly to the pronoun *I*.

The use of *my* by NR in his responses: '*my* priorities', '*my* administration' and '*my* election promises' suggests that NR claims these responsibilities as his own using the pronoun *my*, making it clear that 'these are *my* responsibilities'. The repetition of NR's

description using *my* highlights NR's personal involvement in that matter and at the same time it also contributes to NR's construction of self as a good politician. The word *you know* (Line 8 and Line 32) functions as interpersonal markers (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015) to indicate NR's shared knowledge to show that he is aware that the audiences have some knowledge about the information he presented.

Next, in order to highlight the governments' high level of involvement to solve corruption in the government, NR uses the pronoun *we* as one of BN's members (audience-exclusive *we*) found in Lines 13, 17 and 18, to help him draw the audiences' attention on the actions taken by the government in combatting corruption. However, the next question posed to NR gets a bit tougher, which can be noticed through the abrupt pauses and fillers in his utterances, when VP raised the issue about the allegations made against one of the Chief Ministers, Minister Taib Mahmud, the governor of Sarawak, who was accused of money laundering through the Australian real estate market, whose family is also said to have interests in more than 400 companies in 25 countries. VP's intention in asking the question maybe to find out whether Minister Taib will still be prosecuted according to the law, or will he escape from any punishment due to his status as a Minister. In response to this question, NR must formulate a reply that can help to clear the air. Therefore, in his responses, firstly, NR responded by saying that the people should not jump into any conclusion and he would let the case be investigated under MACC. Secondly, he mentioned that no one is above the law, which suggests that despite Taib's status as a minister, Taib would still have to follow the procedure, and this reflects that the government's law and system are fair.

It is important to note that there is a participation status shift found in Line 22 when NR shifts the use of the pronoun *we* as a member of BN to the use of the pronoun *I* as self-clarification, which helps him to explain that when he talked about the approaches that he had taken in combatting corruption (Lines 18 and 19) "*we* have introduced harsher

punishment (,) .hhh *we* have prosecuted five hundred cases” that he is not personally referring to any specific case that had taken place, for instance, the allegations involving the Chief Minister of Sarawak, Taib Mahmud; but he is talking about all cases in general. Based on NR’s responses, it shows that he is reluctant to talk about the allegations of Taib Mahmud eventhough VP makes an attempt to make NR shares about it with the audience by mentioning the Chief Minister twice; first in Line 21 and second in Line 29. This is probably because the issue could tarnish the ruling party’s reputation and credibility as a political party.

Although NR seems reluctant to comment about the Chief Minister of Sarawak, Taib Mahmud’s corruption allegations, NR’s use of the pronoun *we* enables him to respond collectively and inform the audience about the approaches which had been considered by the government in combatting corruption professionally and shows that NR managed to address the questions within the topic of discussion. Since there was no specific reference in the questions asked by VP to directly refer to NR, answering the questions mostly using the personal pronoun *we* has helped NR to successfully adhered to the maxims of cooperative principles as he listed down a few approaches taken by the government to reduce the rate of corruption in Malaysia.

2NR Extract 1

- 1 FI: Joining us now: on 101 East (,) is Malaysia's Prime Minister - Najib Razak. Sir
2 (,) thank you very much for joining us today.
- 3 NR: My pleasure.
- 4 FI: .Hhh in your outli:ne fo:r the new eco:nomic model you emphasize
5 inclusiveness - uh in the pla:n for a:ll races hh but you've a:lso kept the
6 affirmative actions for the Bumiputera's which is made up o:f about 53%
7 Malays and 12% of the indigenous people (,) .hhh (1.0) but then you've also
8 said there are also affirmative action in your plan is different to the one from
9 the previous. What is the difference about it?
- 10 NR: It's different because uh you kno::w we've learnt from uh implementing the
11 hhh affirmative action in the pa::st uh we kno:w uh where are the weaknesses
12 are =
- 13 FI: What- what a::re the weaknesses?
- 14 NR: Well - I think basically (,) you know we have to cha::nge the wa::y we
15 implement it (,) so that it's more attune huh with the huh current huh market
16 especially the market expectations .hhh huh that it should be market friendly.
17 Huh (0.1) it should be based on merit (?) - it should be huh mo:re transparent
18 (0.2) it should also be on on needs basis (,) and the - you know I emphasized
19 that we have to be fair (,) hhh when you point (,) when we implement an
20 affirmative action (,) it means for the Bumiputera (,) .hhh and the - when we say
21 the Bumiputera (,) is not just - for the Malays (,) it must also include the other
22 indigenous people (,) especially Sabah and Sarawak (?). =
- 23 FI: =Well there has been criticisms (,) that the wa:y [it's been implemented
24 NR: [yes]
- 25 FI: [has been corrupted (,)]
- 26 NR: [absolutely]
- 27 FI: has been abu:sed in the pa:st. Would you agree with that?
- 28 NR: There'll be shortcoming (?) yes (,) I'm not (,) entirely huh disappointed with
29 with the result. I think .hhh huh if you look at it the across the board I mean in
30 new generation hhh of Bumiputeras have emerged huh the you know the entire
31 (,) middle class for example (,) will not be there (0.2) if not for new economic
32 huh new economic policy .hhh and there're quite a number of a (0.4) huh
33 Bumiputeras in the corporate fie::ld hhh managing huge:: enterprises with a
34 great sense of confidence now.

The main reason behind the implementation of the New Economic Model (NEM) is as a way to implement affirmative actions based on need-based rather than ethnic-based. The implementation of NEM is to replace the previous New Economic Policy (NEP) which was developed by the National Operation Council (NOC) soon after the racial riot which took place in 1969 that mainly aimed at eradicating poverty in Malaysia. The goal for the implementation of NEM is to improve Malaysian's economy into a high income and a better growth nation by 2020.

The issues discussed in this extract were mostly concerned with the implementation of NEM and affirmative actions. In response to the first question, NR is giving a specific answer by listing out specifically on the differences between the New Economic Model with the previous model. Using the pronoun *we* as a member of BN suggests that BN has identified the weaknesses in NEP and they have worked on the weaknesses in the implementation of NEM. Instead of specifically listing out the weaknesses of NEP, NR focuses on the aspects that need to be improved by using the word *more* (Line 15) and *it should be* (Line 17) in which the word *it* refers to NEM. The word *must* (Line 21) in NR's response suggests that the implementation of the new affirmative action in NEM focuses on fairness to Malaysians, irrespective of race. This in turn leads to the flouting of the maxim of Manner for failing to give a clear answer. Although NR agrees that the previous implementation of affirmative actions in NEP has been abused, they have made an effort to improve the weaknesses in the implementation of the NEM and even asserted that the implementation of NEM has produced a number of successful Bumiputeras who are managing enterprises in the corporate field. NR also said that the entire middle class would not be there if not for this policy (Lines 31 and 32) to suggest that despite the shortcomings in the implementation of NEP in the past, it has successfully provided significant contribution to the life of Bumiputeras, and in a way saying that they have achieved the objective of the implementation of NEP as it has managed to produce Bumiputeras of middle class group.

Although FI is making an explicit reference to NR using the personal pronoun *you* and possessive determiner *your* (Lines 4 to 9), NR started off answering the question with the pronoun *we* as a member of BN instead of using the pronoun *I* possibly to deflect away from individual attention and responsibility, and present it collectively to reflect that the implementation is a collective effort of BN as a party. Notice that there is a shift in his participation status from the use of the personal pronoun *I* as self-expression, to

the use of *we* as a member of BN in Line 14. The use of the pronoun *we* mostly by NR, in association with the party's action in the past, present and future; which represents a collective identity of the members of the ruling party including him, to highlight their involvement as a united team in the implementation of the affirmative actions in NEM.

NR uses the referent *I* as self-expression to express his personal opinion about the changes that the government need to consider in the implementation of the new affirmative actions in NEM. Whereas the pronoun *I* is used with the verb *emphasized* (Line 18) which is used as self-assertion by NR to show that as a leader of BN, he put strong emphasis on fairness in the new affirmative actions. At the same time, he is also showing that he is personally committed and looking forward towards realizing the plan. There are also the occurrences of the word *you know* which functions as interpersonal markers that help NR to indicate his shared knowledge and show that he is aware that the audiences have some knowledge about the differences in the implementation of affirmative action in NEP as opposed to NEM that he presented in the interview (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015).

2NR Extract 2

- 1 FI: There is no doubt that (,) some Bumiputeras have definitely hhh benefitted from
2 the plan itself (,) but you know there are some who would say (,) .hhh after the
3 nearly 40 years of affirmative action why (?) is there still a need for affirmative
4 action for the Malay for the indigenous people?
- 5 NR: It's because huh you know the goals have not been huh hhh fully achie::ved
6 number one. Number two (,) hhh you know unbridled (,) capitalistic - market
7 economy hhh huh without some degree of affirmative action (,) hhh huh then
8 you will get this marginalization - to appear once again (,) hhh and and that's -
9 will be quite huh catastrophic (,) hhh huh for a society because .hhh huh our
10 society i:s predicated on - on stability (,) and the stability is the bedrock (,) hhh
11 in terms of huh where Malaysia hhh has come from (,) [in in the past ()] from
12 expe:rience
- 13 FI: [We're talking about racial stability?]
- 14 NR: I'm talking about political and racial (?) I mean hhh racial stability is pa:rt of
15 political stability(.) hhh and that's so important because if you have .hhh
16 stability - benefits for all. =
- 17 FI: =Many people have said tha:t thi:s affirmative action has .hh led to:: a
18 generation of uh Mala::ys who feel that they are:: - entitled to the:se special
19 privileges .hhh uh there are some of minority groups who feel sideline - they
20 feel second class because of this affirmative action. These are what the
21 criticisms are saying about this affirmative action (,) do you rea:lly think that
22 there's still a nee:d for affirmative action (,) why not just make it hh you know -
23 affirmative action for all races? =
- 24 NR: =Well - when I said that it should be implemented in a fairer way I mean if you
25 talk about hhh affirmative action it should benefit you know 65% of the
26 population right (,) .hhh and then this of course for non-Bumiputeras and - you
27 must have programs for them - as well and uh becau:se there are:: uh in a
28 market economy (,) uhh if you give uhh promote private sector investment for
29 example (,) and opportunities for the private sector - and naturally the non-
30 Bumiputeras will benefit - from it (,) so to sa:y that we have excluded the uh
31 non-Bumiputera from () is entirely wrong (,) hh =
- 32 FI: = but there ha:s been some opposition fro:m Mala:y Right's groups who fear
33 that perhaps these special privileges (,) hhh their rights may be taken away
34 from them as well (?) =
- 35 NR: =No (,) I didn't say they will be taken away. =I never
- 36 FI: [=but this is what they fear (?) This is what they're saying. This is what]
37 PERKASA is saying.
- 38 NR: [I never say. Yeah I have to engage us ()]
39 But (,) PERKASA is not so extreme (,) if you if you listen to them care:fully (,) .hhh
40 um they can shout about uh - what Malay rights (,) for as long as they are
41 not extre:me in their view:s and huh (0.1) you know to the extent that hhh we
42 can accommodate (,) PERKASA and we can (?) accommodate also the non-
43 Malays as well (?) hhh I do engage the non-Malay groups as well. So:: as a
44 Prime Minister I have always said I'm Minister for a::ll Malaysians.=

The implementation of affirmative action policy was first introduced after the racial riot that took place in 1969 which had resulted from economy disparities between the

Chinese and Malay, whereby majority of Chinese were dominating the economic sector and urban areas, while the Malays were in the agricultural sector and were mostly poor, living in rural areas. In order to solve this problem, the government implemented the New Economic Policy (NEP) as a way to restructure the economic imbalance and the income distribution among different ethnic groups. The New Economic Model (NEM) is an affirmative action policy that is introduced by NR which aims at eradicating poverty and improving the standard of living of all Malaysians, irrespective of race by 2020. However, there is affirmative action policy reserved for the Malays and indigenous people of Sabah and Sarawak also known as 'special privileges' which were said to benefit mostly the Bumiputeras. In Malaysia, the ethnic Malays and ethnic groups of that are native to Malaysia (indigenous people) are also known as Bumiputera, whereas other ethnic groups are referred to as the non-Bumiputera.

In his reply, NR predicated his main reason behind the implementation of the affirmative actions on political and racial stability which he believes is essential and crucial in order to establish and sustain peace among Malaysians. Though the affirmative actions were said to majorly benefit the Malays; in which NR did not agree or disagree too, he, however, emphasized that they have plans and programs for the non-Bumiputeras which serves its own benefit for the non-Bumiputeras too. Based on the responses, it shows that NR does not give a straightforward answer, instead of saying whether or not he thinks that there is still a need for affirmative action despite the criticisms with a yes-no answer, he responded by clarifying on the details of the affirmative actions taken and how it is implemented in a fairer way regardless of the race differences. In his defence to clarify the misconception about the affirmative action that was said to be unfair, the use of the pronoun *our* which is significant to the presentation of *we* in Line 9 helps NR to explain and refer to the society and suggests that he is affiliating himself with the people. At the same time, NR constructs a group of

people including everyone, and one in which he is seen to be one of the people; portrays him as a politician who is concerned to issues that affect Malaysians.

The use of the pronoun *I* as self-clarification found in Lines 14, 24 and 35 helps him to clarify his views to FI about the need for the implementation of affirmative action for the Malays and indigeneous people and highlight what he stands for. The emphasis of his talk in this extract is to show that he does not distinguish Malaysians based on ethnic groups but prioritizes justice in his administration. However NR uses the pronoun *I* as self-assertion in *So:: as a Prime Minister I fully said I'm Minister for a::ll Malaysians* (Lines 43 and 44) to promote himself as a Prime Minister with amicable relationship with Malaysians.

Whereas, there is a shift in NR's participaton status indicated from the shift of the use of the personal pronoun *I* as self-clarification to the use of the personal pronoun *we* as a member of BN (audience-exclusive *we*) in Line 41 which helps to suggest that they were not threatened by PERKASA's view because the members of PERKASA have rights to express their views as long as it is not too extreme. PERKASA is a non-governmental organisation that acts as a protector of the Article 153 of the Constitution of Malaysia, defending the Malay rights and special privileges and is known as a conservative group and their extreme views on behalf of the Malay ethnic, which explains why they were very much against the implementation of affirmative actions in NEM which include inclusiveness for all ethnic groups. Besides that, there are also the occurrences of words/phrases that act as hedges which help NR to lessen the impact of his utterances, for example, the words/phrases: *It's because huh you know the goals have not been huh hhh fully achie::ved number one* (Line 5) in which NR did not specifically addressed what were the 'goals' and in what way were the 'goals' have not been fully achieved; it helps NR to be less direct in his response; hence shows that NR flouted the maxims of Quantity and Manner.

2NR Extract 4

- 1 FI: Prime Minister (.) we are going to have to take a break here. .Hhh when we
2 come back (.) we will have more when we speak with Malaysia's Prime
3 Minister (.) Najib Razak. Stay with 101 East.
- 4 FI: Welcome back (.) to 101 East. This week we are talking with Malaysia's Prime
5 Minister Najib Razak (?) as he completes his first year -in office. Prime Minister
6 (.) you have introduced the concept of 1Malaysia. What is 1Malaysia to you?
- 7 NR: 1Malaysia (?) is about a sense that we are together (.) as one people (.) hhh huh
8 as one nation. And huh I have said that huh hhh (0.2) it is huh base (.) is
9 predicated on a - on a change of mindset (.) and the very minimum would be
10 tolerance. In other words (.) you tolerate one another (.) you know the
11 differences (.) hhh huh racial differences (.) religious differences (.) you tolerate.
12 But that huh that is the basic (.) minimum. Then (.) you go on to the next stages
13 which is um (0.2) to accept it. You know you accept diversity (.) huh a::s a
14 something good (?) for the country. Huh that's the next (.) the next huh () if
15 you like in terms of in terms of (0.1) value system (.) in terms of mindset (.) hhh
16 and ultimately (.) the final (?) if you like (.) will be to celebrate diversity. I mean
17 if you celebrate diversity (.) hhh means you entirely comfortable (.) hhh with the
18 notion of huh a multiracial (.) multi-religious society. =
- 19 FI: =but surely sir (.) after 50 years of independence (.) Malaysians need to be
20 taught how to live harmoniously? =
- 21 NR: =Absolutely (?) [the fact]
- 22 FI: [Why? Why after 5] decades of independence? =
- 23 NR: =Come on (?) look (.) look what happened in Europe (.) I mean hhh even ()
24 () ok? We had problems in Northern Ireland (.) we have extremist even in
25 America. We have more than () as well (.) in America (.) ok. There are
26 extremists in any society (.) (0.3) and including us (.) and the very fact that
27 there are: some extremists (.) in our society (.) means you need 1Malaysia.

In response to the question, NR seems to be answering the question straightforwardly using the pronoun *I* as self-assertion as he listed out the details and highlighted some points and values that are included in 1Malaysia concept and the implementation of 1Malaysia as the base of his policies to help him govern Malaysia. Initially, 1Malaysia is a concept designed by NR on September 16th, 2010 which puts strong emphasis on ethnic harmony, racial unity and effective governance. There are various public services introduced under the 1Malaysia concept for instance, 1Malaysia Clinics which provides basic medical services for illness, like fever, in which Malaysian citizens will only be charged RM1 inclusive of treatment and medication. Other than that, there are also other public services available such as, 1Malaysia Community Wifi, 1Malaysia

Development Berhad, 1Malaysia email, and 1Malaysia People's Grocery Stores which offer goods and services at an affordable price.

According to NR, he believes that the concept of 1Malaysia is crucial as it may help to sustain harmony among Malaysians. Therefore, when NR was asked on why Malaysians still need to be taught on how to live harmoniously even after five decades of independence, NR highlighted the existence of extremists in other parts of the world, like in some parts of Europe and America which suggests that even in the most advanced countries, there are still extremists in the society, which explains why even after 50 decades of independence, there is still a need for a concept that could help sustain harmony and unity of a country; especially a country like Malaysia, where the people are from various ethnic backgrounds.

Then, there is a shift in NR's participation status which is indicated from the use of the personal pronoun *I* as self-assertion to the use of the pronoun *we* as a Malaysian (audience-inclusive *we*) that is frequently used in this extract as a way for him to identify himself as one of the Malaysians, together with the other Malaysians. The use of *we* in: *1Malaysia (?) is about a sense that we are together (.) as one people (.) hhh huh as one nation* (Lines 7 and 8); can also be considered as a way to establish a patriotic feeling in the audience through inclusion and to create a sense of solidarity and unity by establishing the referent as a nation. However, the use of the personal pronoun *we*, for instance in 'we had' and 'we have' in Line 24 and 25 functions as an interactional tool implying that: *you* (the listener) and *I* (the speaker) and others, are all affected by this. It is a means of including everyone by drawing the people and himself into the same group. Whereas its related form 'our' helps to draw the audiences' attention onto the discussion and suggests that the Malaysian people are co-implicated in the implementation of 1Malaysia.

Besides that, the use of the word *I mean* which is marked as a reformulation marker (Hyland, 2007) enables NR to do a restatement or elaboration of his previous statement and present it in a different way to further help reinforced his intended meaning. Based on NR's responses, using mostly the personal pronoun *I* to explain the concept of 1Malaysia shows that NR complied with the four conversational maxims of cooperative principles for being able to explain and provide justifications on the concept of 1Malaysia that is introduced in his administration to FI and the overhearing audience.

1AI Extract 10

- 1 JA: No no (,) I - I um I sometimes feel like speaking this way myself (,) so - so I'm glad
2 you did (,) so (,) Anwar (,) let's - let's talk about um: the future (,) um we have a
3 good portrait of Malaysia now (,) so (,) so (,) let's talk about - where Malaysia's
4 going forward (,) and where the region (,) is going forward? And what is your plan
5 (,) for Malaysia (,) if your opposition coalition was to win government?
- 6 AI: Immediately (,) we should mature as a democracy (,) ok (?) um:: we have um large
7 and much better infrastructure (,) and more educated workforce. Don't treat
8 Malaysia in such a condescending manner that people are not prepared to - um or
9 ready - to be um - exercise their freedom (,) which means (,) independent judiciary
10 (,) free media (,) um:: and economic policy that can promote growth (,) and
11 market economy at the same time (,) understand the abuses (,) when - when we talk
12 about it in our discourse (,) even the 'Arabs Spring' (,) 'Arab Spring' one area (,) clampering for freedom reform (,) then you have occupy wall streets um they have limitations (,) they unbridled the - you know um:: - greed. And and um the gap between the very rich (?) and very poor (,) complicity of - between the big business groups and politics. This we need to avoid (,) because you should learn (about the) from the frustrations and [the
- 18 JA: [From the frustrations in the west?]
- 19 AI: In the west (?) And - and um I mean your experience too (,) and the fact that -
20 they are now exposed to be colleagues (,) and you can sense the - um - hypocrisy
21 - the the um paradox - um and - and contradictions - between this pronouncement
22 and what was actually the missives (,) sent (,) but you made - a major
23 contribution. Not everybody agree (,) with the statement of missives (,) Sometimes the missives are under my expense (,) but - but - I support that (?) You know why? Because (,) you understand - what is real politic (,) what is the so-called - the hypocrisy of the notion of diplomacy (,) that is not based on: truth (,) or morality (,) or ethical standards (,) but, pure () power and parochial of national interest. So I think this need to change. Why can't Malaysia after a half century (,) bring this new sense among Malays (,) um - Chinese (,) Indians or Dayaks that look (,) we are big family (,) we can move up together. Why can't it be done? Why is so - why is it so difficult? It's a rich country you know (?) we have 90 billion ringgit net income from petroleum (,) we are not like most of our neighbours (,) having to import (,) and having this you know (0.6) [drag]=

In response to JA's question about AI's plan for Malaysia if the opposition wins in the upcoming election, AI listed out the things that he would like to change and implement for Malaysia under his governance.

AI uses the personal pronoun *we* in his responses to identify himself as one of the Malaysian people (audience-inclusive *we*) in Lines 6, 30 and 32, at the same time he also speaks on behalf of other members of PR suggesting that the plans were not his personal plan, but it is a plan that is decided upon as a party. Most of the uses of *we* in

AI's response were used to describe the future actions that AI would consider to take in order to improve Malaysia's current economic and political state, which exercises real democratic practice in its governance. Besides that, the use of *we* helps AI to make comparison between Malaysia with what is happening in the Arab countries, to suggest that these were the aspects that he wanted to avoid from happening in Malaysia. The use of the personal pronoun *we* also helps AI to reflect a sense of togetherness and patriotism when he expresses his disappointment despite being a country that has achieved independence after a half of century, Malaysia is still running on the race-based politics in which he thinks should be changed and improved so that all Malaysians of different races can move up together as one big family. AI responses suggest that these were the important aspects which PR would address and also imply that there are still a lot of improvements that the current government need to work on because he believes that Malaysia has the potential to become better since Malaysia has a huge value of net income gained from one of the country's natural resources which is the petroleum that is enough to help improve the condition of the country and the people.

Note that there is a shift in AI's participation status from the use of the pronoun *we* as a member of PR to the use of the pronoun *I* which is used as self-expression when AI expresses the plans that he has for Malaysia. For instance the *I* that is used in conjunction with the word 'think' (Line 28) to express his personal beliefs that the statement of missives could change the hypocrisy of the notion of diplomacy that is supposed to be based on truth, morality or ethical standards and not pure power and parochial national interest.

Although AI's responses suggest some important plans that he has for Malaysia, AI flouted the maxims of Quantity because he offered more information in his responses. Instead of just talking about his future plans that he has for Malaysia, AI talks about the

statement of missives and other aspects of political happenings taking place in other countries. He may have failed to observe the maxim of Quantity and provide more information than is required in order to express his dissatisfaction towards the system and the governance that is exercised by the current government in which he thinks still have flaws, thus, this leads him to compare with the happenings that had taken place in other countries who are also struggling politically to become a better country.

University of Malaya

1AI Extract 11

- 1 JA: = [What would] what would it take (,) fo:r that to be done? [Is it is it is it]
2 AI: [()]
3 JA: a matter of education?
4 ((Pauses))
5 AI: No (,) it is leadership Julian. It is courage of conviction (,) tenacity purpose (,) you want to do something good (,) you must not be corrupt (,) I mean it it it has to work (,) and and of course (,) politic is out of compromise (,) I am not saying like you know (,) you are like a political philosopher (,) dictating issues and – but – there are certain - ground rules - that you have to accept and adopt (,) you know - I mean the moment you say you are for democracy (,) you become a western stooge. The moment you talk about market and economy (,) you become - you know um: Soros agent (,) But you know these things [()]
13 JA: [I have been one of those]
14 AI: You have now - the moment I've an interview with you, you know what is going to happen after this. But I think (,) you know people - you know - um the problem with this authoritarian leaders (,) and at times (,) even leaders in the west (,) they that includes in strong islamophobia (,) this um - we against them (,) this um - you know unilateral policy (,) in the United States .hhh I mean they - um I - I don't - I don't um sense that they even um ascribed to the ideals (,) this initial spirit (,) of the America revolutions (,) or Jeffersonian ideals (,) or the habits of the heart (,) the talk that they talked bout (,) They don't (?) and, and that is our our concern (,) but we have to do it (,) in a small way (,) in a small country (,) not to be ambitious to be a great nation on earth (,) but at least for Malaysia (,) what is it, why is it so difficult? To make a village guy (,) a Malay farmer (,) and a Chinese - petty trader (,) or Indian estate worker (,) feel that they are being respected and recognized as a citizen (,) given the dignity as a Malaysian citizen (,) I don't think it takes a lot. It just takes conscious (,) sincerity (,) and courage (,) of conviction.
28 JA: Anwar Ibrahim, thank you very much.
29 AI: Thank you.

In response to JA's question asking AI what would make it possible to implement the plans that AI has for Malaysia, AI asserted that it is a matter of leadership in order to manage a country well. AI emphasized that as someone who possesses power, one should not be corrupt, should have courage, should be sincere, should stay conscious and must have persistency in order to be a leader and contribute something good for the country.

The personal pronoun *I* in this extract is mostly used by AI as self-expression which helps him to express his views about what he thinks that would change and improve governance in a country. Besides that, AI also expresses his dissatisfaction and criticism that he has for the authoritarian leaders which often associate Islamophobia to the

people and use it as a reason that could help serve the purpose of interest of their respective political parties – in order to sustain power.

Then, there is a shift in AI's participation status from the use of the pronoun *I* as a self-expression to the use of the pronoun *we* as a member of PR (audience-exclusive *we*) in Line 22 to express his opinion which suggests that all Malaysians, despite of race and religion should be acknowledged and respected as Malaysian citizens; suggesting that the government should not only prioritize the ethnic of majorities and left out the minorities and make them feel side-lined because he strongly believes that every Malaysians should be treated equally and stand as one big family. After all, that is what democracy is, people having the freedom to express their disagreement and disapproval against the government and look forward for fair and transparent governance.

There are a number of occurrences of reformulation markers *I mean* (Hyland, 2007) which helps AI to keep the flow of his conversation growing so that the audience would understand the meaning behind the message that he would like to put across and the use of interpersonal markers *you know* (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015) to indicate his shared knowledge about the authoritarian leaders with the audience. From the responses, it shows that AI fails to observe the maxim of Quantity because as he expresses his views, he also made criticisms towards the authoritarian leaders and how they manage a country; which seems to be too much of information to the question asked, but it is still helpful to inform people about something that the people may not be aware of.

2AI Extract 5

- 1 RC: What would you want to change? I mean (,) many people around the region say
2 that: at some point (,) the opposition is going to have a chance (,) to govern
3 Malaysia (,) I would assume that means that you are playing a major role in that
4 (,) .hhh as I said (,) Malaysia are relatively very prosperous country. Um:: there
5 has not - been - a - real - democratic tradition in the west in that sense (,) and so
6 the um I am wondering (,) what would um Malaysia look like under the
7 opposition and under Anwar Ibrahim?
- 8 AI: We focus on the fundamental issues (,) and the constitutional guarantee. Um: we
9 have been independent for more than half (,) of century. We started off: um with
10 the same threshold with Singapore (,) South Korea (,) and Taiwan. Now (,) we
11 have lost out even to Indonesia (,) Vietnam and Thailand (,) and people need to
12 know this. Um: so: um: - whether we want to stay (,) at that level or move
13 forward (,) um do we - I mean countries have um tempted (,) and experimented
14 (,) with democracy although it is fragile (,) and I know the limitations (,) but
15 Indonesia is doing relatively better (,) and the Philippines have maintained (,)
16 resemblance of democratic reform (,) for quite some time now (,) and even
17 Thailand (). But in Malaysia you can't go and demolished temples at will or:
18 arrest people without () to court procedures (,) - and trump up charges (,)
19 and attack people (,) and so I think people are now saying that "look (,) um we
20 are not fools anymore, don't tell us about communist insurgency, or their
21 terrorist cells" and deal with it, be tough against terrorist. We have no sympathy
22 towards that (,) we have no - qualm to support (,) this malicious. But don't use
23 that (,) as a pretext to - () to an attack - the innocent people.

In this extract, RC asked AI about AI's plan to govern Malaysia if the opposition win in GE 13. In his response to the question by RC, AI highlighted that his main focus will be on fundamental issues and the constitutional guarantees of the country as the opposition's primary goals are on practising true democracy, transparent governance, social and economic justice regardless of ethnic groups, and combatting corruption.

AI uses the pronoun *we* as a member of PR to help him express his views and plans he has for Malaysia and at the same time identifying himself as one of the Malaysians because he is expressing his concern not just as the leader of opposition of Malaysia, but also as an ordinary citizen, to some of the areas that he thinks needed serious improvement. Based on his responses, AI's replies indirectly portrayed the current government negatively and that there are major problems with the current administration in which shows that AI flouted the maxim of Quantity and he offered

more information to inform people on how Malaysia is losing out to the neighbouring countries despite its economic stability unlike Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam which are constantly struggling for economic and political stability up until today but are still able to maintain resemblance of democratic reform for some time, compared to Malaysia that is still struggling for a real and transparent democratic practice in its governance.

Then, he shifts his participation status from using *we* as a member of PR to the use of the pronoun *I* as self-expression which enables AI to express his views, for instance in Line 14 and Line 19 apart from sharing about his plan for Malaysia. Besides enabling him to buy time to formulate the best reply to the questions asked, the words *I think* (Line 19) help him to minimize his uncertainties as he expressed his views on the topic discussed. Although the main question asked by RC was central to AI's governance if the opposition party will win in the upcoming election, AI, however, does not address the question as to what required by RC because, in his responses, even though he talked a bit about what his main focus would be in governance, he failed to elaborate on and explain about his plan when he mentioned about 'fundamental issues' and how he will implement them in his governance. Instead, he talked about how the neighbouring countries are doing and compared it to Malaysia. As a result, he flouted the maxim of Quantity for failing to keep the discussion within the topic discussed in the interview.

2AI Extract 6

- 1 RC: Sure (,) ok (,) better governance (,) um:: - wouldn't Anwar Ibrahim government
2 (,) um: -promise - better governance (?) or would it - even - introduce structural
3 reform? Do you feel there is a need for a structural reform in your country? Or it
4 is just really better governance under the - current legal political framework?
- 5 AI: Um I think Ricky (,) it is both. I mean - we have come out with the proper
6 recommendation policy issues (,) both in terms of policies (,) um reform. But
7 also some structural reform is required (,) for example (,) how do you ensure -
8 judicial independence (?) setting up judicial commission um and and um -
9 having having the: um - system in place (?) um: but - I don't - I don't believe in
10 terms of structural reform (,) could be such a radical departure (,) um because
11 the constitution (,) the original constitution guarantees (,) are there (,) but it has
12 been diluted (,) or prostituted (,) to benefit the: cronies (,) and the rich. So I think
13 we start with the economy which I think is paramount (,) because we have lost
14 out you know quite um with other leading countries in Aseans that we have lost
15 out (). So I think we have (,) to re-focus on that (,) but economic um issues
16 of growth (,) would require affirmative actions (,) public housing (,) um judicial
17 independence (,) because now (,) for all foreign investments (,) major
18 investments (,) the judication is always in Hong Kong or Singapore. They don't
19 go to our courts. So it is quite related. And then the quality of education. As I
20 have said we have taken great pride in the past (in with the) University of
21 Philippines (,) - Institute of Management (,) the same like University of Malaya.
22 But now we have not even gone up to top 200 in the region. So we have a
23 problem. So this (is much) are required. And and unlike some of our
24 neighbouring countries (,) we have the resources (,) we have the billions of
25 dollars - down the drain (?) we are not improving the quality of education (,) or
26 health service.

In response to RC's question on AI's agenda on structural reform if the opposition will take over the government or would AI just work on the current legal political framework, AI confirmed that both aspects are required to improve the current system in the government. When RC mentioned about structural reform, it implies changes or adjustments to the current government system as the opposition main policies have always been focused on to improve democratic practice, recover economic struggle, enhance education level, combat corruption and ensure equal wealth distribution among ethnic groups.

In the beginning of his response, AI uses the pronoun *we* as a member of PR to highlight the key elements that his party wished to re-form. According to AI, his governance may not implement a total structural reform to the system, but maybe some

aspects needed to be improved, especially the policies. For instance, in terms of democratic practice, although Malaysia is known as a country that practises democracy in the governance, the current government does not allow for freedom of speech, this is proven by media restrictions and the ban on political rallies in the current government system, while in terms of education quality, the opposition would offer for a direct funding to all types of educational institutions, and minimise students' loan by offering interest-free scheme, which was not offered by the ruling party.

It is important to note that, there are a few shifts in AI's participation status when he uses the pronoun *I* as self-expression (Lines 5, 12 and 13 respectively) to express his views when asked about whether or not he will do a structural reform if he was to win the government in GE 13 to the use of the pronoun *we* as a member of PR, and to the use of *we* as a nation, to identify himself as one of the Malaysians as he expresses his concern towards the matter. He claimed that although there are a lot of resources in Malaysia, the money is not used for the right thing instead of using it to fix other areas that need proper attention and improvement in ensuring Malaysia to be a better country. When AI pointed out the weaknesses of the current governance in his responses, it shows that he flouted the maxim of Quantity as the information provided is just a claim to support his views on what are the changes that he wanted to improve in the current government if Malaysia will be under his governance.

Then, he shift his participation status from the use of the pronoun *we* as a Nation to the pronoun *I* as self-assertion to strongly express his personal opinion on structural reform (Lines 9 and 10) and beliefs about the aspects that he wishes to improve and work on for better governance, for instance addressing the policy issues, judicial independence, economic growth, affirmative actions, public housing, quality of education and health services. AI's responses towards the issue suggest that there are flaws with the current system in the government for instance, as a result of improper management in the

governance, the constitution has been diluted and prostituted for money to benefit ‘the rich and the cronies’. The word ‘cronies’ may suggest that AI is referring to the members of the ruling party who have benefitted the most from this, which in turn led to the flouting of the maxim of Quality, for not providing sufficient evidence to support the claim he made about the constitution and the ruling party. Besides that, AI also claimed that most of the foreign investors have chosen Singapore and Asian countries instead of Malaysia, to infer that there are problems within the governance and these problems have led to this scenario. When AI claimed that the quality of education in Malaysia is poor, when he mentioned about University of Malaya that used to be one of the top universities previously as compared to now, he uses the pronoun *we* to suggest that the reason behind it was as a result of improper management in the government (Lines 20 to 23). The word *I mean* (Line 5) is marked as reformulation marker (Hyland, 2007) which enables AI to restate his previous responses so that it is more comprehensible to the audience.

2AI Extract 7

- 1 RC: So, so a Malaysia under Anwar Ibrahim (,) would addressed this problem but - I
2 guess would it be radically different from from – governance aside - would it be
3 radically different (?) from the current situation (?) for example, will there be a
4 freer media? Will there be more um um independent judiciary? and and will
5 there be more room for dissent (,) under Anwar - Ibrahim's government?
- 6 AI: Well (,) if you talk about um - reform and um democratisation (,) it has to be.
7 We have known um independent of free media for a long time (,) except for the
8 few years (,) after independence. And um - so people have to accept the fact that
9 people will differ and be quite - shocking - experience. I mean, remember like
10 like - um even our party because of the democratic environment (,) people
11 criticize us (,) for having free exchange (,) sometimes it causes a lot of fuss
12 across the nation (,) and they said why are you making so much of - um taking a
13 different position in this issues but you're not familiar with it. But it has to
14 happen - because that is the firm commitment we give.
- 15 RC: Let's not make it harder to govern (,) I mean (,) when you are in the opposition
16 (,) um: I understand that it was not just you in Malaysia - it is anywhere. When
17 you are in the opposition you want - a more independent judiciary (,) you want
18 to be able to go to the media (,) and and um make your complaints (,) you want
19 the courts to work more quickly. But when you are in power (,) and you allow
20 all this stuff to happen (,) does that not make it - more unwieldy (?) um:: to
21 govern?
- 22 AI: Yes (,) you are right (,) absolutely right (,) people do make adjustments when
23 they are in power. I:: cite some of the experience in the Indonesia (,) is quite
24 amazing (,) because after that transformation (,) was the free media (,) the first to
25 be - attacked and sieged (,) other than Suharto in the past (,) is the new leaders.
26 But um: - they have - been able to withstand that. And um - have have accepted
27 that - as a: you know - a norm because they have um given clear - guarantee -
28 that that will be protected. So it has happened (,) um: to me (,) what happened in
29 Indonesia is - very very - important - as - um: showcase (,) because it has
30 worked in Indonesia (,) although the threshold economic development is far
31 lower than us - in Malaysia. [So um::]
- 32 RC: [That] was a successful transition?
- 33 AI: Yes (,) it was a very successful transition until now and um we are citing (,) the
34 massive demonstration these days (,) against the president over this Bank
35 Century scandal (,) but the president stood firm (,) "Yes you have every right,
36 for as long as you don't break the law". I mean you know you don't destroy the
37 building or structures (,) but otherwise you have every right to express you
38 disapproval.
- 39 RC: And you want to see that in your country?
- 40 AI: It has to happen (,) it has to happen (,) and we have to come very clear - to
41 propose specific um:: recommendations (,) and even time frame (,) because
42 otherwise the public will perceive us as a: you know(,) just like the old styles
43 politics giving all sorts of excuses (,) to delay and defer reform.

In this extract, RC raised the two main issues that are related to the practice of governance in Malaysia, for instance, media restrictions and judiciary independence.

Since the media operates under the government's license, there are many restrictions so

as to what goes on air, for instance, they are expected to publicize the ruling party's contributions, achievements and ongoing progress, especially in terms of the country's development. Whereas for the judiciary system, as what was often mentioned by AI, was unjust and unfair since there are still government's influence in the overall process, for instance, during the trial of his sodomy accusations. AI uses the pronoun *I* as self-assertion as it helps AI to convince the audience that freer media has to happen because that is what they offer in their policies. There are also the occurrences of reformulation marker *I mean* (Hyland, 2007) in which is used to provide more information in order to clarify what he has just said in his previous utterances regarding the topic. Although he offers essential information to fulfil RC's requirement in asking that question, AI managed to keep the discourse within the topic of discussion, therefore, he complied with all four conversational maxims in response to RC's questions.

AI has always been vocal about media restrictions and believes that contemporary politics must allow for a freer media and freedom of speech in order to encourage for a more democratic government. When asked about whether he would allow for a freer media in his administration, RC argued that it may somehow be difficult and tougher for AI to govern Malaysia because it might result to other challenges. In his reply, AI took an example to the situation in Indonesia where they have freer media after experiencing transition after the fall of President Suharto as a result of transformation in the government, and still, they were able to withstand the challenges, and AI believes that Malaysia will be able to implement the same practice in governance too. AI shows his support for a freer media although he admitted that he may do certain adjustments in his administration when necessary, because he strongly believes that the people have the rights to express their approval through media and other possible means that they have, but for as long as they don't go against the law and suggests that his government would be able to accept that kind of activities because that reflects the real democratic practice

that a democratic country should have. He may have said this because he knows what it's like to not be able to express his views as the leader of opposition as a result of media restrictions that he has been dealing with throughout his political journey.

Then, he shifts his participation status from using the pronoun *I* as self-assertion, to the use of the pronoun *we* as a member of PR when he highlighted that the opposition party has to be clear in their policies and be specific in their recommendations so that the public will not end up judging their policies and actions. Based on AI's responses regarding the issue, it shows that he is very straightforward in formulating his reply; he would answer with a yes and continue offering more information and views about the issues discussed.

Overall, there are 7 extracts from DSNR's interviews and 5 extracts from DSAI's interviews on the theme of governance. The frequencies for the use of the personal pronoun *I* found in DSNR's responses are 31, and 26 in DSAI's responses. Whereas the frequencies for the use of the personal pronoun *we* in DSNR's responses are 34, and 30 in DSAI's responses.

4.1.3 Theme: Political Party Affairs

1NR Extract 2

- 1 VP: When you speak about the Malaysian people (,) it seems from su:rvey:s that
2 they – are:: (0.3) differentiating between yourself (,) your personal approval has
3 risen (0.2) in the fou:r years that you speak of (,) .hhh but (?) your party UMNO
4 (0.1) remains rather unpopular. How do you explain that?
- 5 NR: I think hhuh in the sense that I have changed (,) (0.2) and I've I've taken this this
6 this personal .hhh huh commitment - that I need to change for the times .hhh huh
7 and and as the leader of the party (,) and as the head of the government hhh huh
8 I must be ahead the change (0.2) and and I'm I'm basically I believe I'm a
9 reformed minded leader of this country (,) .hhh and I brought in huh
10 unprecedented [changes
- 11 VP: [Yes I would like]
- 12 NR: In political economic and hhh and and the entire government this (sphere) but I
13 will concede the party (,) will take time because the party is a collection of (,) (0.2)
14 if you talk about UMNO 3.2 million people .hhh it's the strongest party
15 hhh huh but huh we have that strength we have that the single la:rgest party with
16 three over three million members hhh huh but - you know to cha:nge hhuh huh
17 a big party will take time.
- 18 VP: The elections about two and a weeks away (,)
- 19 NR: No: but people must believe that UMNO is is on track to change hhh huh it is on
20 track huh you know we can see that huh you know we're putting new faces hhh
21 will be [more
- 22 VP: [Other new candidates (,) the candidates]
- 23 NR: The candidates we are more responsive hhh to the needs of the people (,) we are
24 more - people friendly huh we are: engaging with huh you know (,) with the
25 wider constituency because one of the things that I want UMNO to realize that
26 it's not good just being hhh a leader of UMNO (,) (0.1) a divisional leader of
27 UMNO of unite (,) but you must you must have the support - of all the others
28 one who are not your .hhh not your customers if you like you know or not your
29 supporters so:: UMNO has to realize that it has to have the broad appeal.

The issue discussed in this extract is mostly concerned with UMNO's performance over the years, in which from the surveys described by VP stated that UMNO still remains unpopular under NR's administration. UMNO is a founding member under BN which upholds the goals of Malay nationalism and the dignity of race, religion and country. The party also aims at upholding the Malay culture as the national culture and expanding Islam across Malaysia. There have been many criticisms made about UMNO over the years; one of the critics made was during Tun Abdullah Ahmad Badawi's administration where UMNO was accused of a party that is arrogant and corrupt.

UMNO also have lost a lot of seats in the 12th General Election although the number of seats they have won outnumbered those to that of PAS and PKR.

In order to explain UMNO's condition, NR used a lot of *I* as self-assertion to help him express how he felt. The use of the pronoun *I* helps NR to inform the audience that he has changed and that he is aware of UMNO's condition and even honestly admitted that in order to fix UMNO, he must change his political approach in leading UMNO. NR's statement especially the phrase - *as the leader of the party*; and, *as the head of government* (Line 7), shows that he knows his responsibility as a leader of the party. However, although he is using the pronoun *I* to do a lot of emphasizing about himself as the leader of the party, he fails to clearly explain why UMNO is still unpopular under his governance and his lack of explanation leads him to flout the maxim of Quantity for not providing sufficient information that helps to explain why UMNO's popularity still hasn't improved under his administration; instead he keeps on repeating that he must be ahead of change, emphasizing that UMNO consists of more than 3 million members and that they have also included new members in the party - which shows that he flouted the maxim of Manner and the maxim of Relation because his responses were not related to the topic of discussion and failed to explain what is happening inside UMNO's party. The possible reasons behind the flouting of these maxims could probably be because he needs to protect his image as the leader of the party, and defend his party so that the people will not lose their interest in UMNO and question his leadership.

The use of *I* as self-assertion enables NR to assert his role as a Prime Minister of Malaysia found in the phrase - *I believe I'm a reformed minded leader of this country* – (Lines 8 and 9); and *I brought in unprecedented changes* (Lines 9 and 10); and highlight his contribution as a Prime Minister, which also suggests that he has what it takes to be the head of the government and at the same time he is taking a chance to present positive qualities of himself by recounting actions that he took in the past and present.

NR uses the pronoun *we* as a member of BN (audience-exclusive *we*) as he talks on behalf of the members of his party which enables him to identify himself a part of UMNO. The use of the pronoun *we* suggests that as the leader of the party, he is aware that although UMNO is not performing well, UMNO is the single largest party with over three million members and because of that too, people need to understand that it will take time for him to implement and work on the changes in UMNO. Although he agreed that UMNO is not doing well, he puts in a positive spin about UMNO being the largest party and using the pronoun *we*, he even emphasized that as a party they have that strength to improve and win in GE 13. Using the pronoun *we* helps NR to highlight some of the approaches that he has taken, for instance, introducing new candidates that are friendlier and more concerned towards the peoples' need. It is important to note that the use of the pronoun *we* is associated with words/phrases like - the strongest party, the single largest party over three million members portrays UMNO as a united and strong party that still receives the support of the people despite UMNO's controversy and popularity.

1NR Extract 3

- 1 VP: Those people who are not your customers according to the surveys .hhh 21%
2 undecided, 42% would vote for BN (,) 37% for the opposition - Pakatan Rakyat
3 (,) 21% is a lot (,) of people a:nd they come from your very diverse society here
4 in Malaysia. It's one of the hhh things that Malaysia were very prou::d of - but
5 obviously you are aware that it is also critici:zed that for having a race-based
6 political system .hhh and that's one of the things that analysts say, that it's kind
7 of- under test at this point (,) you spoke about your candidate (,) - and how (?)
8 30% of them are going to be new faces (,) But one of them - is not a new face -
9 and he's criticized for be:ing - for having made anti -Hindu statement (,) I'm
10 talking about .hhh for people who are familiar with Malaysia politics. uhh a
11 man called Zulkifli Noordin. Is he re:ally an ideal candidate if that's what you
12 are trying to - put across?
- 13 NR: He - he has changed - he made that statement 10 years ago (,) when he was in
14 PAS .hhh and
15 [and
16 VP: [but the video has gone vi::ral
17 NR: [Exactly (,)
18 VP: now (?)]
- 19 NR: But he did it 10 years ago and he has apologized. He has huh repented .hhh and
20 mind you (,) at that time he even criticized me (0.2) you know but now he has
21 come on board .hhh he was in the PAS party (,) .hhh and you know what PAS
22 party is all about - you see so he had a very very hhuh skewed and warp view at
23 things at that time =
- 24 VP: =What what is the PAS party is all about? =
- 25 NR: =It's a very theocratic and inward looking party (,) it's not hhh really a party that
26 is .hhh stands fo:r hhh real moderation (,) progress hhh and modernity .hhh huh
27 you know - that's that's a kind of thinking (,) and it was a [lot worst before..
- 28 VP: [but there's slating] candidates from other racess
29 people are extremely surprised [to see Chinese
- 30 NR: [but yeah
31 VP: candidates for example]
- 32 NR: Yeah but it's been regressing you know - its its doesn't you know I mean they
33 are committed to introduce hudud and syariah .hhh theocratic huh Islamic (0.2)
34 policies in this country. So do you really think one or two Chinese candidates
35 will make a difference? =

In this extract, VP's questions were explicitly in reference to Zulkifli Noordin, who was once criticised for making an anti-Hindu statement. Zulkifli Noordin is a Sharia lawyer, a Malaysian politician and the vice-president of right-wing Malay organisation, the Mighty Native Organisation or better known as PERKASA. He was elected into the Parliament in the 2008 election and is known for a number of controversies, for instance, he was against the issue over the use of the word 'Allah' in Catholic bible; he was dismissed from PKR, as well as his insulting remarks towards the Hindus. He was a

member of PAS from 1997 and left the party in 2008, and later joined PKR in the same year, only to be dismissed in 2010.

In the discussion, VP wants to know what makes NR think that Zulkifli Noordin is best qualified as an ideal candidate for BN despite having made several controversies in Malaysia's politics especially for making an anti-Hindu statement previously. In response to VP's question, NR tries to portray Zulkifli Noordin in a good light by claiming that *he has changed* (Line 13) and that the statement he made was 10 years ago when he was in the opposition party, PAS (an Islamist Political Party). At the same time, NR seems to volunteer more information by portraying the opposition party negatively when he said that Zulkifli Noordin made that statement *when he was in PAS* (Lines 13 and 14) and *he has skewed and warp view* about Hindu at that time. Apart from that, he also added that PAS is *a very theocratic and inward looking party* (Line 33), and, *it's not really a party that stands for real moderation* – (Line 26), which suggest that NR tried to divert the audiences' attention to the opposition's policies instead of justifying his action for taking Zulkifli Noordin to be one of the candidates in BN despite the controversial issues he once made in the past. His responses show that he flouted the maxim of Relation for not answering the questions with relevant points that could help the audience to understand why NR decided to accept Zulkifli Noordin despite the problems he made in PAS and PKR instead of making negative remarks about PAS.

However, instead of affirming whether or not Zulkifli Noordin is an ideal candidate for BN, NR responds with *he has changed* (Line 13), *he apologized* and *he has repented* (Line 19). Based on the responses he gave about Zulkifli Noordin, he seems to be very biased when giving his personal opinion about PAS since he seems to only magnify on the actions of the party in which he presumes to be radical and indirectly shifting the blame to PAS for Zulkifli Noordin's actions. NR does not justify his reasons for

introducing Zulkifli Noordin as one of the new candidates in UMNO and for doing this; he actually flouted the maxim of Quantity. His response suggests that he wants to convince the people that Zulkifli Noordin has changed since he has joined BN, and NR's failing to respond to VP's question proposes that he tries to avoid from making people having a bad perception about UMNO for accepting Zulkifli Noordin into UMNO.

Based on the negative remarks made about PAS by NR, VP then raised the issue about PAS having Chinese candidates joining them, though NR claims PAS as a theocratic and an inward looking Islamist party. However NR responded with *yeah, but it's been regressing* (Line 32), suggesting that PAS has regressed as the party is obsessed with the ideas of hudud and theocratic policies in Malaysia. Based on the information he offered, NR flouted the maxim of Quality as he gives information that is not supported with evidence to support the claim he made about PAS regression as a political party. NR ended his response with a rhetorical question; wanting the audience and VP to reflect and decide for the answer.

The occurrences of the word *you know* functions as interpersonal markers (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015) that helps to indicate shared knowledge and show that NR is aware that the audiences have some knowledge about Zulkifli Noordin. Whereas *I mean* which is marked as a reformulation marker (Hyland, 2007) enables NR to do a restatement or elaboration of his previous statement and present it in a different way to further help reinforced his intended meaning.

1NR Extract 4

- 1 VP: =Would you:: (0.1) be ready to:: face: the opposition - politicians .hh in a
2 debate? Could we se:e during the campaign (,) “Prime Minister Najib .hh uhh
3 facing off with (.) Anwar Ibrahim”?
- 4 NR: You know – um:: there are many ways (,) in which uh you know - we can –
5 reach out to the public. Debate - is - is only one form of reaching out to the
6 people (.) it’s not the only way hhh =
- 7 VP: = but you wouldn’t rule it out?
- 8 NR: It’s no:t likely we will have a debate because (,) uhh. you know - I believe
9 there’s the important thing for us to (.) .hhh engage the people (,) - and the
10 people .hh throughout this campaign period (,) we will do our (.) engagement –
11 opposition will do their engagement .hhh and hhh the peo:ple will have hh the
12 freedom to choose based on – on - on the freedom of information that they will
13 have. =
- 14 VP: = but if you look at the policies of the manifestoes (,) (0.1) Malaysians are:
15 comparing them and thinking where they are not really that different. =
- 16 NR: =Ooo no:: on the contrary now .hhh that (____) apart. .hhh hhuh we’ve done the
17 numbers I mean the the the huh manifestoes of the opposition is (0.2) wholly::
18 irresponsible .hhh huh physically responsible (.) it is not doable (.) .hhh huh it is
19 pure:ly populist hhh hhuh and huh it’s just:: will lead to huh you know huh (0.4)
20 catastrophic outcome for the country hhh. For example (,) in the first year hhh
21 the deficit of the country will go up to 11.5 % (,) and the state of the current
22 account surplus that we have in the government hhh immediately overnight will
23 be:: in deficit. In other words you will be borrowing money .hhh to pay for
24 salarie:s (,) to pay for subsidies and so forth .hhh

When asked about whether NR would be ready to face the opposition in a debate, instead of using *I* to answer the question, NR uses *we* as a member of BN to respond to VP’s question.

The instances of *we* in this extract is mostly used by NR to refer to the members of BN including himself (audience-exlcusive *we*). Using *we* suggests that NR tries to put across that the decision is not made by him alone, but also by the members of the ruling party as well. The use of *we* in this sense denotes a collective identity which helps to draw the audiences’ attention to BN as a whole and not just on NR individually. NR’s response using *we* suggests that his team have already looked into that matter seriously.

On the other hand, the use of the pronoun *we* enables NR to escape from giving a direct answer by not giving either a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer to confirm whether he would or wouldn’t personally be ready to face the opposition leader, Anwar Ibrahim in a debate;

and lead to the flouting of the maxim of Manner as he fails to avoid ambiguity and fails to provide clear and concise answers.

When VP restates the first question she asked in order to gain for a more specific answer and wanting NR to confirm on the debate, NR uses *I* as self-expression (Line 8) to state his personal opinion about the debate, and how he thinks that there are many ways that he can consider to reach and connect with the public, and that debate is not the only way as long as they made an effort to engage with the public. There is also a metadiscourse marker *I mean* (Hyland, 2007) found in NR's response to help him clarify his response in the previous lines. NR gives an impression that the opposition party is not qualified to run the country when he said the oppositions' manifestoes as *wholly irresponsible*.

Based on NR's responses to VP's question in this extract, the use of the personal pronoun *we* as a member of BN helps NR to evade from answering the questions asked by VP and avoid from claiming individual responsibility. The type of question that VP posed is a question that is linked to NR's political agenda, thus it is considered as a high-risk question which can be noticed from the frequent abrupt halt and brief pauses in between his utterances. Other than that, using *we* as a member of BN in his responses helped him to suggest that as a Prime Minister and the leader of BN, he will always try to minimize any potential threats to his positive face and BN's reputation – thus, he may have responded that way to avoid from future issues that could possibly damage the image of the local authorities which are under the control of his ministers. NR is also trying to inform the audience that as a leader of his party, he may want to use his own method to win the public, as how they used to win for the past 55 consecutive years which may be the reason why NR suggests for a separate engagement.

1NR Extract 11

- 1 VP: Let's talk about the campaign. It could get ve:ry dirty. (0.3) How do you want
2 the campaign to go?
- 3 NR: I would like the campaign to focus more on the policies (.) on the - what kind of
4 direction (.) .hhh Malaysia should take the future destiny of Malaysia (.) and
5 who is .hhh who can be trusted huh (0.2) to lead Malaysia and to deliver
6 Malaysia .hhh in the way that fulfill people's expectation.
- 7 VP: There's a worry that - we could (,) see um (0.3) the first hung Parliament (,) um
8 on the basis of the result. Apparently (,) this is something that analysts and
9 pollsters hhh - can't rule out. Um what (0.2) can you see (?) on the working with
10 the PKR? =
- 11 NR: =We we first of all (,) it is not an outcome that's that's good for the country (.)
12 (0.4) because anything less than strong mandate (,) would lead to greater
13 uncertainty. Um (0.2) but the::: the market the last few days (,) have have huh
14 become - more positive. You know (,) the stock exchanged (,) the ringgit has
15 gone stronger. So I think it bodes well (,) for the general expectation that the
16 Barisan Nasional will do well this election.
- 17 VP: You don't want to talk about the () you think you can - do business (,)
18 under a big tent?
- 19 NR: You know (,) anything is possible in politics (,) because you know (,) I'm I'm
20 I'm someone who really wants .hhh pea::ce and I I want - this country to be
21 stable (.) .hhh and feel that this country has so much promise for the future (.)
22 .hhh and and anyone who belie::ves in that (.) wants to work constructively with
23 me (,) I would welcome that. .Hhh huh but huh if if you embark on policies that
24 will hhh you know undermi::ne the future and trust of Malaysia (,) hh and then
25 that's something different.

The issues discussed in this extract are related to the campaign and the idea of BN working with PKR. In response to VP's question, NR mostly uses *I* as self-expression to express his expectations and goals throughout the campaign. The use of the pronoun *I* with the word 'think' (Line 15), 'would like' (Line 3) and 'want' (Line 20) suggests that NR is expressing his personal requests and his optimism and confidence in winning the upcoming election, to highlight that he is a party leader and an individual politician who personally believes in peace and will fight for peace for the sake of the country and the people. The use of the pronoun *I* enables him to inform the people, specifically the oppositional parties' members that he would welcome anyone who believes in the same principles and policies to work together with BN for a better Malaysia, otherwise, he did not want to.

His responses to the first question suggest that he is personally concerned towards the fate of the people and the country. Moving on to the next question, as VP wishes to know what would be NR's responses on working with the opposition, PKR; this question is rather tough as it is related to his political party. In order to minimize individual responsibility upon answering this question, instead of using *I*, NR changes his participation status which can be noticed through the shift in the use of the pronoun *I* as self-expression (Line 3) to the use of *we* as a member of BN (Line 11) which suggests a collective response to help him answer the question.

Compared to his response to the first question, his response to the second question shows a frequent abrupt halt in between his utterances, as well as the occurrences of interpersonal marker *you know* which to indicate his shared knowledge with the audience (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015). His response to the second question seems to imply that BN doesn't need to work with any other party in order to make the political condition better because Malaysia is currently doing well under the administration of the current government. NR's claim in *because anything less than strong mandate (,) would lead to greater uncertainty* (Lines 12 and 13) is implying that a hung Parliament would only lead to more uncertainties. VP re-stated the same question aiming for a straightforward answer from NR. Without specifically referring to any party, NR uses the word *anyone* as in *anyone who believes in that (,) wants to work constructively with me (,) I would welcome that.* - (Lines 22 and 23), this shows that NR is being ambiguous in his reply which at the same time shows that the use of the pronoun *I* in giving his ambiguous response has led to the flouting of the maxim of Quantity and Manner when he does not provide enough information to explain his stand on the questions asked, but shifts the audiences' attention to another issue.

2NR Extract 5

- 1 FI: Well you also lea::d a pa:rtty that champions Mala:y rights, Mala:y needs, Mala:y
2 interests, and you're also trying to push the agenda of a uni:ted Malaysia. Do
3 you yourself see, the - the irony in this?
- 4 NR: [It's not a zero-sum game.. it's not a zero-sum game
5 FI: [Do you yourself see (,) the irony in this?
6 NR: it's not a zero-sum game::] it's not – it's rea:lity – it's
7 Not a zero-sum game because if you promo:te hh uh interest on Malays uh it's
8 not an exclusion of the non-Malays - I think .hhh there's enou:gh uh - resources
9 for us to help everyone in this country (,) .hhh and I think uh I'm confident in
10 fact (,) uh you know - with the polici:es based on the spirit and and philosophy
11 1Malaysia .hhh that uh everyone will have a rightful place - under the
12 Malaysian side (?) =
- 13 FI: = but you ca:n't get away from the fact that Malaysia - runs on ra:ce based
14 politics.
- 15 NR: Well yeah (,) that's history (,) I mean I cannot change history overnight. I have
16 to hhh I have to:: um take it from - from whe:re it is (,) and where it was when I
17 took ove:r (,) and huh and slowly hhh um huh get Malaysians to:: to be toge:ther
18 in this journey (,) =

The issues discussed in this extract is about BN's policies which fight for Malay rights, needs and interests, that seems conflicting to the concept of 1Malaysia established by NR in his administration which aims for national unity. In response to the questions by FI, when NR said that it was not a zero-sum game, he suggests that when UMNO promoted the rights of the Malays, it was not done at the expense of the non-Malays.

In his response to FI's question, NR seems unsure on how he should respond to the statement posed by FI because the question is political and associated with his political agenda that relates to the aspects of race and religion. NR uses the pronoun *I* as a self-expression to state his opinion and beliefs that Malaysians of all background will get equal benefit as a result of his party's policies. Then, in Line 15 and 16, NR uses the pronoun *I* as self-assertion when he stressed that he is not able to change 'race-based' politics because it was as it is when Malaysia achieved independence, and that is a part of history and suggests that in order for him to change that, it may take a long time. In order to avoid the blame, which might incur as a result of his response, he uses the discourse marker *I think* - to secure his side. To not make his uncertainties obvious, he uses *I* with the word 'confident'.

Whereas in order to support and expand his previous information and what he thinks may be insufficient for others, NR uses the reformulation markers *I mean* (Hyland, 2007) to clarify what he has said earlier in his reply when he said *that's history*. In order to elicit FI's response for his opinion, NR uses the interpersonal marker *you know*. NR's responses also show that he complied with the four conversational maxims as he addressed the questions asked by FI within the topic of discussion using mostly the personal pronoun *I*.

University of Malaya

2NR Extract 8

- 1 FI: =There are: critics who have accused UMNO of becoming .hhh arrogant (.)
2 self-indulgent after (0.2) over 50 years of being in power hhh and that UMNO
3 has lost touch with - the ground sentiment. .Hhhh um (0.5) take for example
4 the last elections (.) UMNO did lose a lot of seats in those elections. .Hhh
5 UMNO has also lost the last 8 out of 10 by elections as well. Hhh is UMNO
6 still relevant (.) in Malaysia? =
- 7 NR: =Of course (?) I truly believe so. Um [the evident lately (,)]
8 FI: [but have lost touch with the ground (,)]
- 9 NR: Ok we we to some extent hhh that's true:. Hhuh but, you know it's a party that
10 has been in power for so long hhh so, the challenge (,) is for us to huh (0.5)
11 present UMNO (.) as a progressive dynamic party (.) hhh and and not for us to
12 be:: in this kind of a syndrome that - we are too complacent:: or that we feel that
13 - whatever we do hhh we're going to get the support of the people (.) I keep on
14 telling people (.) that we don't change. We will be changed by the people. .Hhh I
15 am very frank (?) and I admit (,) - we have shortcomings (.) hhh cause otherwise
16 we wouldn't have done - badly (.) but in the international context (,) it's it's
17 people would love to have the kind of majority of hhh in parliament. =

NR's responses reflect his confidence towards the relevancy of UMNO in Malaysia as a democratic party that stands up for the Malay people. NR clearly expresses his certainty towards UMNO's potential, although the party did not do well in the previous election - which according to the critics was the result of their arrogance and self-indulgent after over 50 years in power. NR also agrees that it was somehow true when he admitted that despite over 50 years administering Malaysia, BN still has shortcoming.

In the beginning of his response, NR uses the pronoun *I* as self-assertion to assert his view as the leader of the ruling party. Then, there is a participation status shift from the use of the pronoun *I* to the use of pronoun *we* as a member of BN (audience-exclusive *we*) with the words/phrases like *we will be changed by the people* (Line 14) in NR's response, which suggests that under his administration, UMNO truly prioritizes the people in determining their future. Although the critics may have portrayed UMNO negatively, but from his responses, they show that NR is not afraid to admit that his party is still dealing with limitations and rather views it as a 'challenge' for them in their

effort to show UMNO as a progressively dynamic party. Then, he shifted his participation status to the use of *we* which suggests that as a leader of the party, NR is also responsible for the ups and downs of UMNO and he is willing to take the responsibility and face the challenge together with the other members towards improving UMNO and be better than before. NR's responses show that he complied with the four conversational maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles as the information he presented addressed the questions asked by FI about UMNO using mostly the personal pronoun *we* in his responses to show that he is speaking on behalf of his party.

Overall, there are 6 extracts from DSNR's interviews on the theme of political party affairs. The frequencies for the use of the personal pronoun *I* found in DSNR's responses are 36, and the frequencies for the use of the personal pronoun *we* are 21.

4.1.4 Theme: Foreign Affairs

1AI Extract 6

- 1 JA: I want to (.) look at this change in the Southeast Asian region (.) so - there was a
2 democracy movement .hhh in Indonesia which was successful (.) .hhh a
3 breakaway or () from Indonesia. What do you think (.) was driving this? Was
4 it the Internet? Was it greater movement of people amongst the region? What -
5 .hhh why this time you had - the Asian economic crisis? Was that (.) one of the
6 drivers?
- 7 AI: You can sense - the change (.) taking place (.) in the region (.) because there's a
8 improved or enhanced (.) level of education. Huh people are getting more
9 sophisticated (.) and among the urban and the sub-urban areas (.) there is also
10 new access to the alternative media. The Internet (.) played - a very significant
11 role (.) people want freedom (?) and you find this - notion - um in the last
12 elections (.) they seem to go with trend (.) particularly among the young (.) and
13 .hhh professionals and intellectuals (.) so, Malaysia's are part and parcels of this
14 change (.) and now with the 'Arab Springs' (.) is more um I think um eminent
15 that we can sense this change (.) coming. Um but (.) you look at Thailand (.)
16 people consider the - democratic transitions somewhat more fragile, but in terms
17 of the commitment towards a democratic transitions was there (.) so any sort of a
18 coup or a military dictatorship (.) cannot - be - um - be expected to sustain for
19 far too long - Philippine's is more (.) um reassuring although they are still
20 having to grapple - with the problem of endemic corruption. But Burma (?)
21 which is quite shocking in terms of change (.) I mean I am one of the voices,
22 lone voices in even Malaysian government those days have never huh had any
23 hope of a military junta (.) reforming itself. Um - but I have to acknowledge (.)
24 that there are some - more positive - um changes taking place in terms of
25 democratic transitions, access to media (.) um - or a freer elections (.) but Burma
26 is way ahead of Malaysia today.
- 27 JA: Burma? Really? [Amazing].
- 28 AI: [Yes yes] (.) because you have Aung San Suu Kyi on television
29 (1.2) and um - [we don't have in Malaysia]
- 30 JA: [Right, and you are not permitted] in practice [on tv]
- 31 AI: [But] but what for
32 certain is they are not democratic (.) I mean we um: fallacious to
33 assume um: that Burma is a democratic country - but, but - you will find some
34 sort of um:: more positive, more reassuring change towards democratic reform (.)
35 [()]

In this extract, JA raised the issue about the successful democracy movement in Indonesia and some other countries of the southeast regions who are going through the same event as Indonesia. The period of transition in Indonesia also known as the 'Reformasi' era begins with the fall of the second President of Indonesia, President Suharto, in 1998, after 31 years serving in the office. President Suharto is known for his authoritarian leadership, in which he has full control of governance which allows

limited external influence. During his administration, he established a regime introduced as 'New Order', a regime that is central to military-dominated government, which had sparked a lot of criticisms and debate in Indonesia. The reformation process after the end of Suharto's administration has allowed for more freedom of speech practised among Indonesians, and within this period, Indonesians are pushing and demanding for stronger democratic governance. In this extract JA asked for AI's opinion on the possible factors that help to contribute to the success of a democratic movement in a country.

In response to the question, AI uses the pronoun *I* as self-expression, found in Lines 14, 21 and 23 which help him to express his views and strongly suggest that he personally believes that besides the improved level of education, the existence of alternative media like the Internet have assisted in the development of politics of a country to a great extent. AI then compared the progress in other countries to the progress taking place in Malaysia, and suggested that as a country that practises democracy, Malaysia has been left out as compared to other countries like Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines; although these countries are dealing with major issues related to poor governance. Notice that there is a participation status shift from the use of the pronoun *I* as self-expression to the use of the pronoun *we* as a Malaysian demonstrated by AI, found in Line 15 when AI mentioned about how he as a Malaysian can feel that there is a change in Malaysian politics, when the young generation and the intellectuals are more concerned about politics nowadays, especially with the presence of the Internet and he believes that other Malaysians could sense it too.

AI's responses regarding democracy imply that Malaysia's political system needs immediate and serious improvements in order to keep up with the progress of other countries in the Southeast Asian region in terms of democratic practice. Apart from that, AI also mentioned about the 'Arab Spring' which refers to the movement towards

democratization that took place in the Arab League. These movements include revolutionary demonstrations that first started in Tunisia somewhere in December, 2010 and then began to spread to other parts of Arab countries.

Besides that, AI revealed how the opposition in Burma is given the chance to be on television, unlike the opposition in Malaysia. This statement by AI suggests that although Malaysia is a democratic country, the opposition in Malaysia did not receive a fair treatment from the government and the way AI expresses his views on Burma's government and how much better their governance are as compared to Malaysia's, which portrays the Malaysian government negatively. The possible reasons for this could be because the media in Malaysia are mostly operating under government's license, and therefore, there are limitations and restrictions that they need to follow, for instance, not to portray the government negatively.

Although AI's responses show that he is very observant towards the changes taking place not just in Malaysia's but also the changes in other countries in the Southeast Asian region, AI's responses show that he has actually flouted the maxim of Quantity for giving too much information than what is required by JA. However, lengthy information would help JA and the overhearing audience to relate to the topic discussed in the interview and help to give a perfect example as to how the role of the Internet among the youngsters and professionals has made it possible for a democratic movement to take place successfully in a country. This is because, the level of education is improved, the young people have more resources in keeping up with the political progress in their countries, for example, the Internet and social network instead of solely relying on traditional media.

1AI Extract 7

- 1 JA: [What what do you see] - what do you see - is this security situation .hhh emm
2 “Julia Gillard (,) the Australian Prime Minister has now agree to station some 3000
3 US marine (,) in the north of Australia (,)” um as a um clearly as a sort of - long
4 term (,) pushback against any possible Chinese influence - .hhh what’s going to
5 happen to these countries (,) in the middle? um:: do you think (,) that the Asian
6 countries (,) should form a united security pact?
7 AI: I am not that a great supporter of the security pacts (,) um:: but there should be
8 strong regional understanding (,) um:: between these countries political (,) economic (,) cultural. And and that would be enough (,) to show that you can deter
9 (,) any form of possible interference by outside (,) forces. Be it the West (,) or
10 China um:: because security pact Julian (,) for our countries (,) would require
11 enormous sums of money (,) it will always be the expense of education (,) public
12 health (,) housing (,) and property elevation (,) and I have that huge problem in my
13 mind.
14
15 JA: If we don’t have some kind of security pact or alliance with the Southeast Asians
16 .hhh states (,) won’t it be the case that China picks off an alliance here (,) another
17 country um () with the United States (,) an:d in that way (,) um (2.1) there’s
18 no (1.2) coherent (spheres) in Southeast Asia but rather there are sort of chessboard
19 with black squares and white squares and everyone .hhh on one side or the other ?
20 AI: We we can avoid that (,) not necessarily by having a national security pact. But
21 strong regional um body that have clear understanding (,) and that parameter would
22 include (,) not to - allow any of our countries (,) to be a base for the super powers
23 (?) this was the arrangement before (?) I mean the Philippines has a problem
24 because they already had [()]
25 JA: [They already had the US for a long time]
26 AI: Yeah but their understanding was (,) not to increase.

In this extract, JA raised the issue on the security pact and asked for AI’s opinion on whether or not the Asian countries, like Malaysia, should form a united security pact, as to what had been done by Australia. Security pact can be considered as a military alliance between countries which have had an agreement of supporting each other militarily against any security threats. Recently, Australia agreed to enhance security agreement with United States, as a long term measures against China’s influence.

In response to JA’s question, AI uses the pronoun *I* as self-assertion, which can be found in Line 7 and Line 13 to help him show his disagreement on the needs for Asian countries to form a security pact. Because he believes, it will require a huge sum of money in order for a country to form a security pact and it is not practical to be implemented in the Asian countries, although it might be useful in the long run.

According to AI, instead of investing a lot of money in that, it would be more beneficial and useful for the government to spend it in something far more important for instance, the expenses of education, public health, housing and property elevation. AI also stresses that forming a security pact is not the only option to secure a country from security threats, and asserts that regional understanding between countries would be enough. There is also the presence of the reformulation marker *I mean* (Hyland, 2007) in AI's utterances which helps AI to give clarification on his statement in the previous utterances about the topic and make his statement more comprehensible. The use of the pronoun *I* in this extract has helped AI to present his views about forming a national security pact for Asian countries. The use of the pronoun *I* had led him to successfully respond to the topic discussed in the interview and the information he shared are useful not only for JA but also for the overhearing audience to make inferences. There is a participation status shift from using the pronoun *I* as self-assertion to the use of the pronoun *we* (audience-exclusive *we*) when AI refers to him and JA found in Line 20 as they talked about the issue.

Based on AI's responses to the questions asked by JA, it is shown that he complied with the four maxims of cooperative principle using mostly the personal pronoun *I* in his responses to express his views about security pact.

2AI Extract 1

- 1 RC: First of all Sir, welcome back to Manila. It is nice to see you well (.) um: you are
2 here for a brief visit (.) and I have heard some of your remarks. You were talking
3 about the way of democracy - and how: .hhh you know - it is not enough just to
4 have elections (.) but you are also now have to start making sure that the
5 institutions (.) are credible and independent. The judiciary um - in particular
6 concern about the judiciary (.) .hhh do you think that Asians countries (.)
7 perhaps (.) yours and mine - are still (1.1) a few years away from that (?) or do
8 you think that is going to happen sooner than that perhaps (.) many of us think?
- 9 AI: Philippines – uh:: here (.) um - despite all the limitations you were talking about
10 (.) and um the concerns about the - electoral process (.) and the judiciary system
11 - of course is far ahead (.) as compared to Malaysia (.) um but the thing um the -
12 nobody could um can - can deny the fact that the systems get fragile (.) because
13 the institutions are not deemed to be that strong. So we will have to start (.) by
14 ensuring a very fair (.) free (.) transparent elections (.) and electoral process (.)
15 and then, to start building these institutions (.) because it is a wise concern about
16 the issue of endemic corruption in our countries.
- 17 RC: It sounds very familiar when you were talking (1.1) about these issues. I know
18 you are referring um: to some extent about your country (.) but when you talk
19 about .hhh elections being credible or not (.) um when you talk about the
20 judiciary's independent being questioned (.) um when you talk about corruption
21 (.) um - a lot of those things are issues that we talk about here (.) .hhh in Manila
22 as well. So it seems to be a lot more – um: similarities (.) at this point where the
23 two countries are - even on the surface it didn't looked that way.
- 24 AI: But again (.) the positive point here (.) is that (.) when you discuss this (.) this is
25 of course being discussed in the media (.) so it is in - within the public domain.
26 When we discuss this (.) it is probably in the confines of the Parliament (.) or the
27 opposition circles (.) because the media is completely in control (.) by the ruling
28 establishment. So, there is a big difference here (.) that you must engaged (.) and
29 encouraged (.) an open, public discourse on these issues.

In this extract, RC pointed out AI's remarks on the idea of democracy and how the independent judiciary is of important aspect in order for a country to practise real democracy. There are three main points that were highlighted by AI in this extract, i.e. the judiciary system, the electoral process and media restrictions. When AI highlighted these three aspects that will be under his government, his responses suggest that the current government is not exercising true democracy practice in their governance.

In response to the question, AI uses the personal pronoun *we* as a member of PR as he speaks on behalf of other oppositional members (audience-exclusive *we*). When AI mentioned about judicial independence he may suggest a judicial that is free from

government's influence and pressure which allows the judges to act with integrity and justice. Speaking from his experience, AI claimed that the judiciary system in Malaysia is not sufficiently independent although they claim to be so. Thus, he emphasized on judiciary independence under his administration, one of the aspects that he would want to re-structure.

Besides that, in terms of media restrictions, AI's responses suggest that the current government in Malaysia is not being equally fair in their administration for not giving the opposition their rights to be in the media which can be seen in Line 24 to Line 29. The mainstream media in Malaysia are hugely under the government's control, they are expected to highlight and publicise the ruling party's contribution and progresses made throughout the whole country and portray the opposition negatively. The ruling party hugely relies on these mainstream media as compared to the Internet. Meanwhile, as for the opposition side, they completely rely on the use of the Internet, which is the only medium that is free from government's influence and pressure. In his responses, AI compared the government of Philippines to the government of Malaysia and claimed that the Philippines are doing better and already far ahead from Malaysia in terms of having credible and independent institutions.

Moreover, AI also considered the Malaysian electoral system as fragile as a result of corruption in the governance. For instance, there are a number of corruption issues related to the ministers of the ruling party, for instance, the Chief Minister of Sarawak, Taib Mahmud who was accused of corruption involving millions of dollars, and the Chief Minister of Selangor, Khir Toyo who was accused of corruption involving a construction project which intrudes Bukit Cahaya Seri Alam in Shah Alam.

When RC mentioned that there are not much differences between the Philippines and Malaysia in terms of the credibility of elections, the independent judiciary and corruption, AI in his reply suggests that the condition in the Philippines is better

because the opposition party in the Philippines is allowed to be in the media unlike the opposition in Malaysia. Since the discussion is on political matters and how they are similar (Philippines and Malaysia), AI has flouted the maxim of Quantity by offering more information than that is required as it could help him to give a lot of other information about the ruling establishments in Malaysia to the audience. The information provided by AI portrays the current government negatively but it helps to inform the people about what is actually going on his side.

Overall, there are 3 extracts from DSAI's interviews on the theme of foreign affairs. The frequencies for the use of the personal pronoun *I* found in DSAI's responses are 8, and the frequencies for the use of the personal pronoun *we* are 6.

4.1.5 Theme: Presidential Legacy

1NR Extract 12

- 1 VP: What happened to your predecessor hhh might happen - to you (?) if the Barisan
2 Nasional (0.1) doesn't (0.2) win convincingly (,) as in gaining back one of its (,) lost
3 constituencies from - last time um and winning (,) you know (,) (0.3) ha::lf
4 of the seat. (0.3) Um (0.4) that could be the end of the:: hhh Najib's
5 administration. What would you:: want people to know – about - your record to
6 remember about your record?
- 7 NR: Hhuh I'm not ready to write (,) my legacy yet (.) and the I'm - working tirelessly
8 - to ensure that Barisan Nasional will win (,) and win convincingly (,) and I'm
9 taking one step at a time. And to me: there's pure academic (,) to go into that
10 kind of argument. .Hhh and in any case (,) huh as I said UMNO would be a more
11 democratic party (,) and they are free to choose their leaders.(0.3)
- 12 VP: Thank you very much Dato' Prime Minister Najib Razak.
- 13 NR: Thank you.
- 14 VP: Thank you for joining us.

The use of the pronoun *I* as self-assertion is frequently used by NR in his responses in this extract; which is mostly used to confidently express his expectations about what he wants to be known as if BN lost in GE 13. NR's reply suggests that he is serious in taking his responsibility as a Prime Minister of Malaysia and he is not solely in the field with the aim to have his own legacy.

Based on his responses, it shows that NR did not really comment on what if the next election will be the end of NR's administration. Instead, he raised the point that he is currently working very hard to ensure that BN will win. NR uses the pronoun *I* with phrases like 'working tirelessly' (Line 7) and 'taking one step at a time' (Line 9) to suggest that he prioritizes the people and the country and is willing to do anything to ensure that the government, under BN, will continue to serve the country and win in GE 13. NR even talks about UMNO, emphasizing that the party will improve and become a more democratic party and that the members are free to choose who would lead the party.

The use of *I* as self-assertion by NR which has helped him to state what he desires of accomplishing as a Prime Minister has led to the flouting of the maxim of Quantity, as

he fails to provide enough explanation on VP's question and the maxim of Manner as he brings the focus of what was asked to another topic instead of giving a clear picture on his future actions if GE 13 is the end of the BN administration.

University of Malaya

2NR Extract 11

- 1 FI: You've come from - political aristocracy. What do you think your: legacy will
2 be?
- 3 NR: Hhh I wouldn't have gone that far yet (,) to think huh I don't think I want to:: to
4 I - you know (,) to put the huh what do you call it put the cart before the horse. I
5 think what I like to do:: is to get o:n with you know (,) the four pillars that I have
6 mentioned (0.2) huh as part as our main agenda of the government (,) a:nd and
7 and that the people judge me in time to come.=
- 8 FI: =Prime Minister thank you very much for speaking with us. .Hhh and that's all
9 the time we have for this edition of 101 East (,) from a:ll the team here in Kuala
10 Lumpur Malaysia. Thanks for watching.

NR uses the personal pronoun *I* in his responses as a self-expression to highlight and express his personal hopes for Malaysia, under his administration. Instead of commenting on what he thinks his legacy will be, NR's response suggests that it is too early for him to think that far after only four years being a leader in the government.

NR then brings the focus of the discussion on the four pillars, which are the government's main agenda, and his response regarding this suggests that his main concern would be to work on the four pillars and accomplish it during his administration and leave it to the people to observe and judge his leadership and capabilities as the Prime Minister of Malaysia along with time. There are also the occurrences of the reformulation markers *I mean* (Hyland, 2007) to help him formulate the best reply to the questions asked; and the interpersonal marker *you know* (Zand-Moghadam & Bikineh, 2015) to show that he is aware that the audiences have some knowledge about the information he presented. Based on NR's responses, the use of *I* as self-assertion has led to the flouting of the maxim of Quantity, as he fails to provide enough explanation towards FI's question and the maxim of Manner for not giving a clear picture on how he wants his legacy to be.

Overall, there are 2 extracts from DSNR's interviews on the theme of presidential legacy. The frequencies for the use of the personal pronoun *I* found in DSNR's responses are 11, and no occurrence for the use of the personal pronoun *we* found.

University of Malaya

4.1.6 Theme: Personal Issues

1AI Extract 3

- 1 JA: When I when I was in in prison (,) and I read Cancer Ward this book by Aleksandr
2 Solzhenitsyn (,) which is a very a wonderful (,) wonderful book (,) but (,) very very
3 depressing (,) um and very brutal (,) um but (,) I felt like as worst (,) as the places
4 that I could be (?) I could be in Siberian cancer ward (,) with cancer (,) for instance.
5 And and - what did you feel as - this is of interest to me (,) because I have a
6 number of friends (,) who have been in prison (,) .hhh your: view about how to
7 han:dle the experience - .hhh did you have a method (?) how did you control the
8 perception of a passage of time (,) and things like this ?
- 9 AI: Well (,) it was tough (,) I mean I mean now you think it may sound easy but at that
10 particular time it was tough (,) because I was um: you know my kids were still
11 small then - the youngest was still in kindergarten (,) and the day - that time I was
12 arrested (?) I could s:ee I mean I could just picture - their anguish - and despair (?)
13 but (,) what gave me some strength - the prison officers and guards - were -
14 extremely friendly (,) they were very scared (?) there were cameras all around (,)
15 but we can sense their - sympathy (,) and support (,) that - keeps you going (?)
16 because then there are some whisperings (,) about what was happening (,) about
17 demonstrations outside - um:: but otherwise (?) I just kept um - myself just very
18 busy (,) not all serious Julian (,) I could be very honest. Um I spend a long (,) not
19 long hours but a certain (,) in the washroom (,) in the bathroom (,) singing the
20 Beatles (,) or Ricky Nelson (,) or Elvis Presley.

In this extract JA shared his experience when he was in prison with AI and related to AI's experience of reading books in the prison. JA is asking AI to share his personal view and experience on how he handled the experience being in prison and how he made use of his time when he was in prison.

AI's responses suggest that he did not have any specific method to deal with the whole process but he always kept himself very busy but not necessarily on serious issues, and he tried to enjoy his time and daily routines as usual despite being in prison. Apart from that, according to AI, his family, the prison officers and guards were the ones who had given him strength to endure the pain of having to leave his family for a long period while his children were still young. At the same time, his responses also infer that some of the prison officers and guards showed him their sympathies and were very friendly despite what he needed to go through in the prison as a prisoner.

The use of interpersonal marker *you know* suggests that AI is asking JA and the overhearing audiences to make inferences about the trial that was charged against him despite his condition at that time, where he had to leave his wife and his children who were still young when he was first arrested and how the events had emotionally affected his children for having to experience growing up without their father around and how it had also affected him to accept the fact that he would not have the chance to see his children grow up. The use of the pronoun *I* in his responses was mostly as self-expression as he talked about his personal experience before and after he was in prison. AI uses the pronoun *I* to express his sadness when he looked at his children at the time he was arrested by the police because he knew at that moment, he would not be able to be around them anymore and watch them grow up; this was before he became a prisoner.

In his responses, AI also uses words that describe his frustration about the topic discussed, for instance, the words: *tough*, *anguish*, and *despair* which help to express his feelings about what had taken place earlier in his life, as a result of the controversial issue. Despite the frustration expressed by him, AI also uses words that show his positivity and his sense of hopefulness regarding his experience as a prisoner, for instance, the words: *strength*, *sympathy* and *support* to express his feelings and what makes him feel encouraged to move on.

Based on AI's overall responses to the questions posed by JA, it shows that AI answered the question using mostly the personal pronoun *I* to share how he made use of his time while in prison which also indicates that he adhered to the four maxims of conversation in his reply.

2AI Extract 8

- 1 RC: Alright (.) we were talking about you as the opposition (.) speaking of the
2 opposition (.) um: I know that this is a private visit and you are a private citizen
3 (.) but um: I note that um: when you come here (.) you visit friends (.) and um in
4 variably they tend to be with the opposition (.) Um: Mr. Estrada (.) () (.)
5 around your agenda (.) um: what do you talk about with them?
- 6 AI: You know I meet friends. Um:: they can be from the government or from the
7 opposition (.) it just happen that my two family friends (.) very close family
8 friends (.) um: I mean I have quite a number of them (.) but then um I have
9 known them for a long time which is the Aquino family (.) and the () Arab.
10 So: um - in almost variably in every visit I made (.) from the time I was in
11 government (.) until now (.) I have not failed to meet and discuss with them.
12 Well (.) we discuss about policies (.) family (.) and then moved on to what is and
13 happening now that they are going to be presidential candidates (.) what they
14 stand for (.) what about their reform agenda (.) what is the level of support (.)
15 and you know – (um and the)=
- 16 RC: = So you do compare notes?
- 17 AI: We do compare notes quite a bit (.) ya - ya -
- 18 RC: But I also know (.) that the President Estrada is not just an ally politically (.) I
19 mean he stood up for you (.) at the time you needed it (.) but you know, it is also
20 a personal - friendship isn't it?
- 21 AI: Yes, it's true. I mean (.) with President Estrada for example (.) he took even
22 even the normal Asean sort of norm - of non-interference to an extent that you
23 can ignore friends in difficulty (.) I didn't share that sentiment (.) that is why he
24 met my wife (.) Azizah in Kuala Lumpur (.) and invited my daughter to
25 Malacanang (.) um and then um:: President Aquino in fact received Azizah (.)
26 arranged for her um: you know - like her own sister (.) and then um it went a
27 long way (.) since then. So I think um: I mean um: that speaks volumes about the
28 um: you know um not only personal friendship but um the - the passion - of
29 many of my friends and the colleagues of () and the media (.) for that
30 matter on the issue of freedom and justice.

Based on the questions asked by RC, it shows that RC is aware that AI has a few close friends who are also politicians from the oppositional party in Philippines who share the same agenda on reformation. President Aquino or also known as Benigno Aquino III is the 15th President of the Phillippines who has served from the year 2010 until 2016. Whereas Mr Estrada or also known by the name Joseph Estrada is the 13th President of the Phillippines who have served in the office from 1998 until 2001. Before he entered politics in 1967, Mr Estrada was a popular film actor.

When talking about his colleague in the Phillippines, AI uses the pronoun *we* (audience-exclusive *we*) to refer to him and his colleagues as he shared about what they often do

when they meet up. According to AI, he became friends with Mr Estrada and Mr Aquino since the time he was in the government to suggest that the friendship was not for any political purpose. AI also confirmed that each time they meet, they will share and discuss a lot about policies and update each other on their political affairs by comparing notes. Although the friendship seems rather personal, AI's responses suggest that they have been friends for a long time and most importantly, they did not intervene into each other's political affair, but they do share ideas about reformation since they are on the same page in fighting for freedom and justice. Notice that there is a participation status shift from the use of the pronoun *we* to the use of the pronoun *I* as self-assertion demonstrated by AI as he shared about his friendship with Mr Estrada and Mr Aquino and how they have a lot in common in politics.

In response to RC's questions, AI seems to have answered all of the questions straightforwardly with a yes and provides a clear explanation and information to help support his response using mostly the personal pronoun *I* and the personal pronoun *we* when he is referring to him and his colleagues. His responses indicate that he complied with the four conversational maxims.

Overall, there are 2 extracts from DSAI's interviews on the theme of personal issues. The frequencies for the use of the personal pronoun *I* found in DSAI's responses are 16, and the frequencies for the use of the personal pronoun *we* are 8.

4.2 Summary of Chapter Four

In this chapter, the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*; and the accomplishment or flouting of maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles are analysed based on Goffman's (1981) participation framework, Goffman's (1981) concept of footing and Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principles and the analysis is presented in each of the extract, according to its theme. The findings obtained in this chapter will be discussed and concluded in the next chapter.

University of Malaya

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the main findings of this study are discussed and explained. The first part of this chapter will present the findings obtained to answer the first research question: How do two prominent Malaysian politicians use the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in political interviews and what are the possible reasons behind such use?; and the second part of this chapter will present the findings obtained to answer the second research question: How does the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* assist the two prominent Malaysian politicians to accomplish or flout the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles in political interviews? The summary of the findings and conclusion are presented at the end of this chapter.

Based on the findings, there are similarities and differences in the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*; and in the observance of conversational maxims between Dato' Seri Najib Razak (DSNR) and Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim (DSAI) in their respective political interviews. This study revealed that both of the pronominal choices made by these politicians in their interviews are used to accomplish certain communicative goals. In addition, the observance or flouts of conversational maxims also occurred in their responses and the occurrences differ depending on the topics discussed. However, it is shown that the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* assist them in the accomplishment or flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles maxims when they are confronted with provocative issues mostly in order to save face as political figures.

5.1 Comparison in the use of Personal Pronouns *I* and *We*

This section seeks to answer the first research question, which is: How do two prominent Malaysian politicians use the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in political interviews and what are the possible reasons behind such use? Based on the findings, there are similarities and differences in the ways DSNR and DSAI responded to the questions asked in interviews in terms of their use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*. Table 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 below show the occurrences of each personal pronouns *I* and *we* that are used by DSNR and DSAI in their respective interviews. The questions asked in the interviews are categorised according to the topic discussed or themes, such as, political affairs, governance, political party affairs, foreign affairs, presidential legacy and personal issues. The frequencies of the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* demonstrated by DSNR and DSAI in each of these themes are noted.

5.1.1 Occurrences of the use of Personal Pronoun *I*

Table 5.1.1 shows the average use of the personal pronoun *I* between DSNR and DSAI in their respective interviews. Please note that the comparison of the use of the personal pronoun *I* between DSNR and DSAI can only be made for theme of political affairs and governance because only these two themes are found in both of their interviews. Whereas on the theme of political party affairs and presidential legacy, the findings can only be discussed for DSNR, and on the theme of foreign affairs and personal issues can only be discussed for DSAI.

Table 5.1.1 The average use of Personal Pronoun *I*

Themes \ Politicians	DSNR	DSAI
Political Affairs	5	6
Governance	4	5
Political Party Affairs	7	-
Foreign Affairs	-	3
Presidential Legacy	6	-
Personal Issues	-	5

Table 5.1.1 shows that DSAI uses more personal pronoun *I* when speaking about political affairs and governance. The findings for the use of the personal pronoun *I* and its main discourse functions that are evidenced in DSNR's and DSAI's are presented in Table 5.1.2 and it will be further discussed and explained accordingly starting with the theme on political affairs and then governance, and followed by the themes that are available in DSNR's interviews which are political party affairs and presidential legacy to the themes that are available in DSAI's interviews which are on foreign affairs and personal issues.

Table 5.1.2 shows the patterns in the use of the personal pronoun *I* demonstrated by DSNR and DSAI in their interviews. The patterns of the discourse functions are organised from the highest to the lowest occurrences of the use of the personal pronoun *I* in each theme.

Table 5.1.2 Discourse functions of the use of Personal Pronoun *I*

Themes	Discourse Functions	
	DSNR	DSAI
Political Affairs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>I</i> as self- expression 2. <i>I</i> as self- assertion 3. <i>I</i> as self-clarification 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>I</i> as self-assertion 2. <i>I</i> as self-expression
Governance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>I</i> as self-assertion 2. <i>I</i> as self-expression 3. <i>I</i> as self-clarification 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>I</i> as self-expression 2. <i>I</i> as self-assertion
Political Party Affairs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>I</i> as self-assertion 2. <i>I</i> as self-expression 	-

Foreign Affairs	-	1. <i>I</i> as self-expression 2. <i>I</i> as self-assertion
Presidential Legacy	1. <i>I</i> as self-assertion 2. <i>I</i> as self-expression	-
Personal Issues	-	1. <i>I</i> as self-expression 2. <i>I</i> as self-assertion

On the theme of political affairs in DSNR interviews, the first obvious pattern is the use of *I* as self-expression that helps DSNR to express his views on a topic and convey the state of his emotion, for instance, to express his personal opinion as the leader of BN about the descriptions made about his party for GE 13 in 1NR Extract 1 (Line 6), to express his views on PERKASA's remarks in 2NR Extract 3 (Line 12), to express his views on Malays' special privileges in 2NR Extract 7 (Lines 11 and 12), to express his personal views about the action taken to combat corruption in the government in 2NR Extract 9 (Line 10) and to express his views of AI's sodomy trial in 2NR Extract 10 (Line 5). The second clear pattern that can be seen in the use of the pronoun *I* by DSNR is the use of *I* as self-assertion which enables DSNR to strongly speak his views on a concept or to clear up a misunderstanding of his policies/actions among the audience or interviewer, for instance, to state the action taken by him in dealing with the attacks in Lahad Datu in 1NR Extract 9 (Lines 13 and 14), to express his opinion that he does not think that the issue in Lahad Datu will affect BN's reputation in the upcoming election in 1NR Extract 10 (Line 11), and to assert that he wants the Malaysian people to truly become a 1Malaysia society in 2NR Extract 6 (Lines 11 to 17). While, the third clear pattern that can be seen in the use of the personal pronoun *I* by DSNR is the use of *I* as self-clarification to help him explain and confirms that he has never made a claim that he will change what is in the constitutions of Malaysia in 2NR Extract 7 (Lines 4 and 5).

Meanwhile, on the theme of political affairs in DSAI interviews, two clear patterns can be seen in the use of the personal pronoun *I*. The first clear pattern is the use of *I* as self-assertion to put emphasis on his experience when he was arrested in 1AI Extract 1 (Lines 4, 8 and 9), to inform how he was badly assaulted in the prison in 1AI Extract 2 (Lines 4 to 6, 9, 14 and 16), to stress on how the opposition parties did not get a minute of airtime unlike the pro-government party in 1AI Extract 5 (Lines 6, 7, 9 and 15), to highlight on some of his experiences in the Parliament in 1AI Extract 8 (Lines 14 and 16), to strongly express his resentment of the case in 1AI Extract 9 (Lines 5, 7 and 9) and to suggest that he is innocent and was just another victim to serve the purpose of the pro-government's agenda in 2AI Extract 9 (Lines 5 and 6). While the second clear pattern noticed is the use of *I* as self-expression to express his state of emotion about an issue/topic/political events for instance to express how he felt greatly encouraged by the support shown by Malaysians towards him in 1AI Extract 4 (Lines 13 and 14), to express his dedication in taking his responsibility as a leader in 2AI Extract 2 (Lines 12, 13, and 21), to express his feelings to suggest that the ruling party is using the issue to create a security problem in 2AI Extract 3 (Lines 24, 25, 31 and 37) and to express his resentment as the leader of the opposition party in 2AI Extract 4 (Lines 11, 14 and 24).

On the theme of governance in DSNR's interviews, the first clear pattern of the use of the pronoun *I* is the use of *I* as self-assertion to put forward his personal beliefs on the way he and other Muslims should act in order to resemble a true Muslim in 1NR Extract 6 (Line 23), to put strong emphasis on fairness in the new affirmative actions in 2NR Extract 1 (Line 18), to promote himself as a Prime Minister with amicable relationship with Malaysians in 2NR Extract 2 (Lines 43 and 44), to explain the concept of 1Malaysia in 2NR Extract 4 (Line 8). The second clear pattern is the use of *I* as self-expression to express about the country's accomplishment under his administration in 1NR Extract 5 (Lines 7 and 8), to express his disagreement towards VP's statement

about the issue of race 1NR Extract 7 (Line 27), and to express his personal opinion about the changes that the government must consider in the implementation of the new affirmative actions in NEM in 2NR Extract 1 (Line 14). The third clear pattern that can be seen is the use of *I* as self-clarification, to explain that when he talked about the approaches that he had taken in combatting corruption in 1NR Extract 8 (Lines 18 and 19) and to clarify his views to FI about the need for the implementation of affirmative action for the Malays and indigenous people in 2NR Extract 2 (Lines 14, 24 and 35). While in DSAI's interviews, the first clear pattern of the use of the personal pronoun *I* is the use of *I* as self-expression, to express his plans for Malaysia in 1AI Extract 10 (Lines 24 and 28), to express his views about what he thinks that would change and improve governance in a country in 1AI Extract 11 (Lines 6, 7 and 26), to share his plans for Malaysia in 2AI Extract 5 (Lines 14 and 19), and to express his views when asked about whether or not he will do a structural reform if he was to win the government in GE 13 in 2AI Extract 6 (Lines 5, 12 and 13); and the second clear pattern of the use of the personal pronoun *I* is the use of *I* as self-assertion to strongly express his personal opinion on structural reform in 2AI Extract 6 (Lines 9 and 10) and to convince the audience that freer media has to happen because that is what they offer in their policies in 2AI Extract 7 (Line 23).

Moving on to the following themes that are only available in DSNR's interviews, which are the theme on political party affairs and presidential legacy. On the theme of political party affairs, the clearest pattern of the use of the personal pronoun *I* is the use of *I* as self-assertion to inform the audience that he has changed and that he is aware of UMNO's condition in 1NR Extract 2, to stress that he is not able to change 'race-based' politics in a short period of time in 2NR Extract 5 (Line 15 and 16) and to assert his view as the leader of the ruling party in 2NR Extract 8 (Lines 7, 13 to 15). The next clear pattern is the use of *I* as self-expression to state his personal opinion about the

debate with DSAI in 1NR Extract 4 (Line 8), to express his personal requests and his optimism and confidence in winning the upcoming election in 1NR Extract 11 (Line 15) and to state his opinion and beliefs that Malaysians of all background will get equal benefit as a result of his party's policies in 2NR Extract 5 (Lines 8 and 9). For the theme on presidential legacy, the clearest pattern for the use of the personal pronoun *I* is the use of *I* as self-assertion to confidently express his expectations about what he wants to be known as if BN lost in GE 13 in 2NR Extract 11 (Lines 4 and 5) and *I* as self-expression to express his expectations and goals throughout the campaign in 1NR Extract 12 (Lines 3, 15 and 20).

As for DSAI's interviews, the themes that are only available in his interviews are foreign affairs and personal issues. On the theme of foreign affairs, the first clear pattern that can be seen is the use of *I* as self-expression to express his expectations and goals throughout political campaigns in 1AI Extract 11 (Line 3) and the use of *I* as self-assertion to help him show his disagreement on the needs for Asian countries to form a security pact in 1AI Extract 7 (Lines 7 and 13). And on the theme of personal issues, the clearest pattern of the use of the personal pronoun *I* is *I* as self-expression found when he talked about his personal experience before and after he was in prison 1AI Extract 3 (Lines 9 to 12 and 17, 18) and the use of *I* as self-assertion, to share about his friendship with Mr Estrada and Mr Aquino and how they have a lot in common in politics in 2AI Extract 8 (Lines 10 and 11).

5.1.2 The purpose for the use of Personal Pronoun *I*

As political figures, both DSNR and DSAI strive to present the best version of themselves as individuals to the audience and this is mostly accomplished using the personal pronoun *I*.

In DSNR's interviews, he frequently uses the personal pronoun *I* to highlight his personal involvement in political events and to express his personal view on political matters that had taken place in the past or current issues taking place at present times. Similar findings in the use of the personal pronoun *I* found in Hakansson's (2012) study which found that the use of the personal pronoun *I* helps politician to show his/her commitment and personal involvement in an issue. Besides that, he also uses the personal pronoun *I* for other different purposes, for instance, to draw the overhearing audiences' attention on him as he expresses his personal opinion about an issue in order to portray his high sense of self-responsibility as a leader. The personal pronoun *I* was mostly used in his interviews to highlight his quality as a Prime Minister by associating an issue with his past, present or future actions which is also similar to the findings in Allen's (2006) where the use of the personal pronoun *I* in the discourse of the former Prime Minister of Australia, John Howard, and Former Member of the Australian House of Representatives, Mark Latham were mostly to present the positive aspects of themselves as individual politicians, rather than just as party representatives, because it imparts an egocentric aspect to their talk.

Whereas in DSAI's interviews, he uses the pronoun *I* for a number of purposes, for instance: to express his personal opinion, to justify his past circumstances regarding the sodomy issues, to indicate his previous and current personal involvement in his political journey, especially his previous experience in prison. The emphasis of DSAI's talk using the personal pronoun *I* is mostly on his previous experience being in prison, regarding his previous sodomy case that he was accused of in the past as well as on his

previous experience as a minister working in the government. Besides being able to express his personal opinion, the use of *I* enables him to do a lot of explanation about his past condition, especially in the issue of the sodomy case. Since he was not given any chance to defend himself in the media whilst being in prison, as a result, he sounded so strong every time he was asked about it especially on how the experience had affected his image, life and political journey, to suggest that he is innocent and a victim of the case which is similar to the findings in Adegoju's (2014) study where Moshood Abiola, a Nigerian politician found to be using the personal pronoun *I* to highlight himself as a victim of perceived injustice.

These purposes differ depending on the context of the questions and it is mostly perceived that the use of the personal pronoun *I* helps them to present aspects of them and make known of their views on different political issues. Besides that, the use of the personal pronoun *I* is also to serve the purpose of their political agendas which is to present their parties in the best of light, and to portray their opponents negatively.

5.1.3 Occurrences of the use of Personal Pronoun *We*

Following the study done by Chen (2007) which categorises the personal pronoun *we* into propositional *we*, impersonal *we*, and dramatic *we*; this study, however, particularly examines the propositional *we*, which is subdivided into audience-exclusive *we* and audience-inclusive *we*; and the impersonal *we* which is also considered as generic *we*. The audience-exclusive *we* refers to the speaker and the members of a political party which they belong to, such as the use of *we* as a member of BN/PR; while the audience-inclusive *we* shows that a speaker is speaking on behalf of the audience irrespective of which political party they choose or belong to, such as, the use of *we* as a Malaysian/Nation; and the use of generic *we* refers to people in general without referring to anyone in particular which is especially useful when making generalizations

that can also include the speaker. In this study, the most noticeable patterns of the use of the personal pronoun *we* are the use of audience-inclusive *we* and audience-exclusive *we*, but not generic *we* as it only occurs in one of DSNR's interviews, and none in DSAI's interviews.

Table 5.1.3 The average use of Personal Pronoun *We*

Themes \ Politicians	DSNR	DSAI
Political Affairs	3	2
Governance	5	6
Political Party Affairs	4	-
Foreign Affairs	-	2
Presidential Legacy	0	-
Personal Issues	-	1

Table 5.1.3 shows DSNR uses more of the personal pronouns *we* when discussing about political affairs; whereas DSAI uses more of the personal pronouns *we* when discussing about governance. Please note that the comparison in the use of the personal pronoun *we* in DSNR's and DSAI's interviews can only be made on the theme of political affairs and governance because only these two themes are available in both of the interviews, meanwhile the themes on political party affairs and presidential legacy are only available in DSNR's interviews, whereas the themes on foreign affairs and personal issues are only available in DSAI's interviews. Therefore, the findings obtained in these respective themes will only be discussed according to each politician, and not in comparison between the two.

Table 5.1.4 shows the findings for the use of the personal pronoun *we* and its main discourse functions that are evidenced in DSNR's and DSAI's and it will be further explained and discussed accordingly following the theme on political affairs, and then the theme on governance; and then followed by the themes that are only available in DSNR's interviews, which are political party affairs and presidential legacy; and

finally to the themes that are only available in DSAI's interviews which are on foreign affairs and personal issues.

Table 5.1.4 Discourse functions of the use of Personal Pronoun *we*

Themes	Discourse Functions	
	DSNR	DSAI
Political Affairs	1. <i>We</i> as a member of BN 2. <i>We</i> as a Malaysian	1. <i>We</i> as a member of PR 2. <i>We</i> as a Malaysian
Governance	1. <i>We</i> as a member of a BN 2. <i>We</i> as a Malaysian 3. Generic <i>we</i>	1. <i>We</i> as a member of PR 2. <i>We</i> as a Malaysian
Political Party Affairs	1. <i>We</i> as a member of BN	-
Foreign Affairs	-	1. <i>We</i> as a member of PR 2. <i>We</i> as a Malaysian
Presidential Legacy	No occurrences of <i>we</i>	-
Personal Issues	-	1. <i>We</i> to refer to him and JA

First and foremost, on the theme of political affairs, the discourse functions of the personal pronoun *we* used by DSNR and DSAI show similar patterns, i.e. the use of *we* as a member of a party (audience-exclusive *we*) to speak on behalf of the members of the ruling party and *we* as a Malaysian/Nation (audience-inclusive *we*) that is used to establish solidarity with the Malaysians. In DSNR's interviews, the use of *we* as a member of BN (audience-exclusive *we*) can be seen in 1NR Extract 1, 1NR Extract 9, 1NR Extract 10, 2NR Extract 9 and 2NR Extract 10. Meanwhile for the use of *we* as a Malaysian (audience-inclusive *we*) can be found in 1NR Extract 1. Whereas in DSAI's interviews, the use of *we* as a member of PR (audience-exclusive *we*) can be found in 1AI Extract 5, 1AI Extract 8, 2AI Extract 2 and 2AI Extract 9; and the use of *we* as a Malaysian can be seen in 2AI Extract 3 (Lines 25 and 31).

Moving on to the theme on governance, the most noticeable pattern of the use of the personal pronoun *we* in DSNR's and DSAI's interviews are the use of *we* as a

member of a political party, and *we* as a Malaysian. In DSNR's interviews the use of *we* as a member of BN (audience-exclusive *we*) can be found in 1NR Extract 5, 1NR Extract 7, 1NR Extract 8, 2NR Extract 1, 2NR Extract 2 and the use of *we* as a Malaysian can be found in 1NR Extract 5, 1NR Extract 6, 1NR Extract 7 and 2NR Extract 4; and the use of generic *we* which is used by NR to refer to people in general, which is to the people who believes in real moderation in 1NR Extract 6 (Lines 7 and 8). And in DSAI's interviews, the use of *we* as a member of PR (audience-exclusive *we*) can be seen in 1AI Extract 11, 2AI Extract 5, 2AI Extract 6 and 2AI Extract 7; and the use of *we* as a Malaysian can be found in 1AI Extract 10.

Next is the pattern of the use of the personal pronoun *we* that are found in the themes that are only available in DSNR's interviews, which are the theme on political party affairs and presidential legacy. On the theme of political party affairs, the most noticeable pattern of the use of the personal pronoun *we* is *we* as a member of BN (audience-exclusive *we*) which can be found in 1NR Extract 2, 1NR Extract 4, 1NR Extract 11 and 2NR Extract 8. As of the theme on presidential legacy, there are no occurrences of the use of the personal pronoun *we* found in the extracts 1NR Extract 11 and 1NR Extract 12.

Last but not least are the patterns for the use of the personal pronoun *we* in the themes that are evidenced only in DSAI's interviews which are the themes of foreign affairs and personal issues. On the theme of foreign affairs, the most noticeable pattern is the use of *we* as a Malaysian (audience-inclusive *we*) found in 1AI Extract 6 and the use of *we* as a member of PR seen in 2AI Extract 1. As of the theme on personal issues, the use of *we* that is evidenced in DSAI's interviews is *we* to refer to him and JA.

5.1.4 Contributing factors to the high and low use of audience-inclusive *We*, audience-exclusive *We* and generic *We*

The different patterns in the use of the personal pronoun *we* that is evidenced in DSNR's and DSAI's discourse could be contributed by some possible factors that determine their use of the personal pronoun *we* when responding to different sets of questions. Inigo-Mora (2013) claims that the use of personal pronouns in a discourse is influenced by a complex set of factors and the speakers' choice of pronoun may be used to achieve certain interpersonal goals. The contributing factors for the different patterns of the use of the personal pronoun *we* in the discourses of DSNR and DSAI are discussed below.

Firstly, the factor that could determine the use of audience-inclusive *we* (*we* as a Malaysian/Nation) in DSNR's and DSAI's discourse could be because the audience-inclusive *we* enables them to make the overhearing audiences feel included and involved in the politicians' talk. For instance, in DSNR's and DSAI's interviews, they often use audience-inclusive *we* to refer to themselves including the audience as Malaysians, for instance when talking about the country's growth. The audience-inclusive *we* enables them to take on the participation status of someone speaking on behalf of the audience and include them in what they are saying, and grab their attention as they speak. The use of audience-inclusive *we* helps them to affiliate themselves with Malaysians and as a result, they are constructing an image of a group of people which includes everyone, and one in which they are seen to be one of the people – a politician who is concerned about the issues that affect Malaysians.

Whereas the factor that could determine the use of audience-exclusive *we* (*we* as a member of BN/PR) in DSNR's and DSAI's talk is mainly to refer to the members of their respective parties to signal the collective work of the ministers and making the inclusion of them in the decision-making process explicit. Besides that, the audience-exclusive *we* enables them to portray that the accountabilities of an issue or conflict as a

result of their actions are not entirely on the leader, but on the party as a whole in which is useful when the politicians wish avoid from questions that could pose a threat to their positive face. The use of audience-exclusive *we* suggests that the emphasis of their talk is central to their political parties and not specifically to them as leaders of the party. It is common to detect the association of the use of *we* with their positive actions and attributes in order for them to construct an image of a political party of integrity as they take on the participation status of representative of their respective parties. Formulating answers to the interviewer's question in terms of collective response enables them to balance out their individual responsibilities as politicians too.

Another factor that could contribute to the use of the different types of *we* is the speakers' political purpose as agreed by Allen (2007) and Inigo-Mora (2013). As politicians, DSNR and DSAI have different purpose in politics, their political parties embark on different policies and they have different views in governance. It is via language that they are able to spread their political message and ideologies as leaders of their respective parties in order to gain the publics' trusts. According to Karapetjana and Rozina (2009), politicians have to communicate in order to inform, persuade, advertise and so forth; hence, they are concerned with their use of language. As politicians, they have different approaches and strategies in spreading their political ideologies, their use of different types of *we* could be one of their strategies to achieve certain political purpose.

As for the generic *we* (*we* and people in general), it can be used to refer to everyone or any group which is not a part of the talk, for instance in DSNR's discourse which he used to refer to the people who believes in real moderation in 1NR Extract 6 (Lines 7 and 8). In general, the personal pronoun *we* always invokes a collective identity or group membership (Bramley, 2001), but the different contexts in which *we* occurs enable politicians to achieve different effects in political discourse. Generally, in the use

of the personal pronoun *we* by DSNR, the highlight of his discourse in his interviews is central to BN being in power for over 55 years, implying that the party is a strong party and has been the voters' choice for over a few decades. Apart from this, he constantly points out that for as long BN has been in power; the government has brought in a lot of significant changes, improvement and development in Malaysia. Since BN has the privileges to serve Malaysia for over 55 years, there are a lot of points that DSNR could raise in the discussion, for instance, he constantly highlights the government's contribution in the past, and as a result of the actions they have taken in the past, Malaysians are able to witness Malaysia progressing tremendously since Independence in 1957. Unlike the opposition, the emphasis of DSAI's talk is mostly on the on-going actions that the party is currently working on in a few states, and their plans to implement necessary actions in the future. They may have had several minor accomplishments in the past and present, but they may have encountered some difficulties in letting the public be informed due to the fact that they have not been given equal chances, as opposed to BN, to be in the local media as what is always highlighted by DSAI in his responses.

5.2 Grice's Cooperative Principles Analysis

This section is dedicated to answer the second research question, which is: How does the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* assist in the accomplishment or the flouting of the maxims of Grice Cooperative Principles demonstrated by the two prominent Malaysian leaders in political interviews? Based on the analysis of the data, the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* assist in the accomplishment or flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles through the shift in participation status within the participation framework as outlined by Goffman (1981). The shift in participation status allows the interviewee to construct a different identity in response to the questions asked, for instance, in the beginning of a response, a politician may use the pronoun *I* to claim credit about his/her personal contribution in politics, however, when they want to deflect away from bearing the responsibility of a conflict or controversy, they use the pronoun *we* to indicate collective responsibility (Bramley, 2001), similarly to what was demonstrated by DSNR and DSAI in the interviews. The findings obtained from DSNR's and DSAI's interviews will be further discussed below. Table 5.2 presents the pattern of observance and flouting of maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles in each of the themes in DSNR's and DSAI's interviews respectively. The pattern of the observance and flouting of Grice's maxims are organised from more to less occurrences found in the extracts of each theme.

Table 5.2 The observance and flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles

Theme	DSNR	DSAI
Political Affairs	1. Flouting of Quantity 2. Flouting of Manner 3. Flouting of Relation 4. Flouting of Quality	1. Flouting of Quantity 2. Flouting of Quality 3. Observance of maxims 4. Flouting of Relation
Governance	1. Flouting of Quantity 2. Flouting of Manner 3. Observance of maxims	1. Flouting of Quantity 2. Flouting of Quality 2. Observance of maxims

Political Party Affairs	1. Flouting of Manner 2. Flouting of Quantity 3. Flouting of Relation 4. Observance of maxims 5. Flouting of Quality	-
Foreign Affairs	-	1. Flouting of Quantity 2. Observance of maxims
Presidential Legacy	1. Flouting of Quantity 2. Flouting of Manner	-
Personal Issues	-	1. Observance of maxims

The comparison on the observance or flouting of maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles in DSNR's and DSAI's interviews can only be made particularly for the theme on political affairs and governance because only these two themes are available in both DSNR's and DSAI's interviews. Whereas the themes on political party affairs and presidential legacy are only available in DSNR's interviews; and the themes on foreign affairs and personal issues are only available in DSAI's interviews. Therefore, the findings obtained for each of these themes will only be presented and discussed for each politician.

On the theme of political affairs, there are no occurrences of observance of the four maxims found in DSNR's interviews, but are evidenced in DSAI's interviews in 1AI Extracts 1, 4, 5, and 8. In DSNR's interviews, the occurrences of the flouting of maxims found from the highest to the lowest are Quantity which can be found in 1NR Extracts 1, 9, 10 and 2NR Extracts 3, 7 and 10; followed by Manner which can be found in 1NR Extracts 9 and 2NR Extracts 6 and 9; Relation which can be found in 1NR Extract 1 and 2NR Extract 9; and Quality which can be found in 2NR Extract 3. Meanwhile in DSAI's interviews, the highest to the lowest occurrences of flouting are Quantity which can be found in 1AI Extracts 2 and 9 and 2AI Extracts 2,3 4, and 9;

followed by Quality which can be found in 1AI Extract 9 and 2AI Extracts 3 and 9; and Relation which can be found in 1AI Extract 2.

Based on these results obtained for the theme on political affairs, in terms of flouting of maxims, it shows that DSNR has attempted more flouting as compared to DSAI when discussing about political affairs as evidenced in the extracts listed in the previous paragraph. This could be because the questions asked in DSNR's interviews when discussing about political affairs were mostly related to the disputes that are linked to the ruling party, for instance, the implementation of NEM and affirmative action for the Malays and indigenous people of Sabah and Sarawak, the corruption controversy involving the Chief Minister of Sarawak and the implementation of the concept of 1Malaysia and how it is relevant in his administration. These questions are what Bull and Fetzer (2006) regarded as questions which posed particular kinds of 'communicative problems' in which politicians would end up equivocating to conceal the truth by responding in terms of the collective *we* especially when they were asked questions which are related to their personal roles or political beliefs. This is when the shifts in DSNR's participation status occur which is signalled through the shift of the use of the personal pronoun *I* to the use of the personal pronoun *we*. The use of the pronoun *we* plays a significant role in assisting NR to respond to these kinds of questions because this is when the use of *we* as a member of a party is most useful, to help him deflect from his personal responsibilities as a Prime Minister, which was what Adegoju (2014) regarded as a strategy of avoiding from self-humiliation in order to protect the politician from any direct attack. Which is why, based on the findings, there is a clear pattern for the use of the personal pronoun *we* as a member of a party on the theme of political affairs found in DSNR's interviews. The results for DSNR and DSAI in terms of flouting of maxims are similar to the findings obtained in Fahdly's (2012) study; where President Susilo Bambang was found to frequently flout the maxim of

Quantity the most, in order to avoid answering questions that posed a threat to his face as a politician. In line with Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principles framework, a speaker has to be as informative as required, and should not say more or less than it is required in order to observe the maxim of Quantity.

As evidenced in this study, the flouting of the maxim of Quantity often takes place when DSNR and DSAI offer too much information or less information than is required by the interviewer. According to Fahdly (2012), although too much information is regarded as an act of flouting a maxim, lengthy explanations enable the overhearing audience to understand the context of the discussion better and less information enable politicians to protect their positive face throughout the interviews. However, in some instances of the interviews, when the information given is more or less than it is required, the responses often turn out to be vague and ambiguous. Thus, when this happens, it leads to the flouting of the maxim of Manner at the same time, as a result of failing to avoid ambiguities when giving answers, which is mostly evidenced in some of the themes in DSNR's interviews but not in DSAI's interviews.

On the theme of political affairs, the flouting of the maxim of Manner is the second highest evidenced in DSNR's talk, but not in DSAI's talk. The flouting of the maxim of Manner often took place when DSNR mentioned and highlighted about the government's contribution in the country's growth using the personal pronoun *we* in order to divert the audiences' attention onto something else, instead of addressing the main question that requires his response. So, the use of *we* as a member of BN is advantageous in this case for it helps him to portray the ruling party as a united and strong party for their lengths of experience in governing Malaysia, as compared to their opponents. According to Grice (1975), the maxim of Manner requires a speaker to avoid ambiguity, that is to say, to be clear as they speak.

As for DSAI, the second highest noticeable flouting pattern is the maxim of Quality. In his interviews, DSAI seems to offer responses that focus on the ruling party's weaknesses in governance, and how he believes the accusations made against him were a part of the ruling party's agenda. Which is why the occurrences of the personal pronoun *I* demonstrated by DSAI when discussing on political affairs is higher than that of DSNR. The clear pattern of the use of *I* on the theme of political affairs in DSAI's interviews is the use of *I* as self-assertion which enables him to strongly express his claims and defend his rights as the leader of the opposition party especially when he shared his experience being in prison and how the opposition was not given equal rights to media access, and the rights for spreading their political messages to the public which limit their political movements and activities. The flouting of the maxim of Quality that is evidenced in DSAI's interview is achieved through the use of the personal pronoun *I* as self-expression as he expresses his personal views on a number of scandals involving the members from the ruling coalition, for instance, the murder case of Altantuya Shaariibuu which he claimed to be closely associated to DSNR and a political analyst in the government, although this has yet to be proven. Since some of his remarks made against the ruling party are not supported with sufficient evidence, especially when he claims that the murder case was closely associated with DSNR and when he said that the trial that was charged against him was a part of a complot of the ruling party, it shows that he failed to observe the maxim of Quality. Grice (1975) notes that a speaker must be truthful when they are engaging in a talk and when they make claims about a certain thing, they must support it with evidence, in which DSAI fails to do so.

The third highest pattern of flouting that is evidenced in DSNR's interviews on the theme of political affairs is the flouting of the maxim of Relation followed by the flouting of the maxim of Quality. The maxim of Relation requires a speaker to provide relevant information. However, the occurrences of the flouting of the maxim of Relation

often took place when DSNR provide information that does not addressed the main questions asked by the interviewer. The use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in flouting the maxim of Relation enables DSNR to shift the topic to something else when he refused to address the main questions that were directed to him in the interviews. For example, when the interviewer mentioned about the ruling party's weaknesses, DSNR often emphasized and highlighted the fact that the ruling party is able to sustain their power for over 55 years in governing Malaysia, despite their shortcomings, and further added the contributions they had made along the years. Whereas the flout of the maxim of Quality is when DSNR made claims about his opponent without support of any evidence, for example when he claims that PERKASA is supportive of UMNO, despite the negative remarks that were made by PERKASA against the ruling party. While the lowest flouting pattern demonstrated by DSAI is the flouting of the maxim of Relation.

On the theme of governance, there are occurrences of observance of the four maxims found in DSNR's and DSAI's interviews. In DSNR's interviews, the occurrences of observance of the four maxims can be seen in 1NR Extract 8 and 2NR Extract 4; and in 2AI Extract 7 in DSAI's interviews. Based on these findings, it is shown that DSNR has attempted slightly more observance of Grice's maxims as compared to DSAI. The use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in DSNR's and DSAI's responses helps to signal the compliance of Grice's maxims as accomplished by DSNR and DSAI when they acknowledge the reference *you* in the interviewer's questions and provide responses using the personal pronoun *I* instead of *we*. Similarly, when the questions asked by the interviewer requires them to respond as a party, or as a Malaysian, they provide responses using the personal pronoun *we* instead of *I*. The most noticeable pattern of the flouting of Grice's maxims in DSNR and DSAI talk are similar on the theme of governance, which is the flouting of the maxim of Quantity. However, the second noticeable flouting pattern seen in DSNR's interviews is the flouting of the

maxim of Manner, and the second noticeable flouting pattern seen in DSAI's interviews is the flouting of the maxim of Quality. The two most noticeable patterns for the flouting of maxims in DSNR's interviews on the theme of governance are the same on theme of political affairs, which are the flouting of the maxim of Quantity, followed by Manner. The reasons for this could be because on the theme of governance, the questions that were asked by the interviewer to DSNR were mostly related to the ruling party's action in the past and present. Some of the actions taken by them in the past were criticized, for instance, the implementation of affirmative actions in NEP and NEM which is believed to only benefit the Bumiputeras as compared to other ethnic minorities, or the non-Bumiputeras. Another example is the implementation of the concept of 1Malaysia, which has triggered the feelings of insecurities among the Malay people because the objective of the concept focuses on national equality across ethnic groups, which is believed to challenge Article 153 in the Constitution of Malaysia, which preserves the special privileges of the Malay people and the indigenous people of Sabah and Sarawak. As a result of these questions, DSNR seems to be using more of the personal pronoun *we*, as opposed to the personal pronoun *I*, when the questions asked were mostly in direct reference to him based on the use of the personal pronoun *you* in the interviewers' questions. This is because the use of the personal pronoun *we* enables him to deflect from bearing individual responsibilities of the implementation and present it as a collective effort of the members of BN. The use of the personal pronoun *we* as a member of BN in the theme of governance is essential as it helps him to present issues as a collective ones, while the use of *we* as a Malaysian enables him to establish solidarity with Malaysians, and portrays him as a Prime Minister that is concerned about the country and its people.

As of DSAI's interviews, the second most noticeable flouting pattern after Quantity is the flouting of the maxim of Quality. In his interviews, DSAI talked a lot

about his sodomy trial that was charged against him twice using mostly the personal pronoun *I* in his responses as he expresses his disapproval of the ruling party, as well as a lot of negative remarks made about the ruling party especially when he claimed that the oppositional party was not given a minute of airtime in the local media mostly using the personal pronoun *we* as he speaks on behalf of PR members. The flouting of the maxim of Quality demonstrated by DSAI is as a result of his failures to provide evidence to the claims he made about the ruling party's, as what is outlined by Grice that in order to observe the maxim of Quality, a speaker must be truthful and avoid saying something false or that is not supported by sufficient evidence. This is because, the claims he made about the ruling party can also be seen as a part of his political strategy to tarnish the ruling party's reputation, as a way for him to convince the overhearing audience and gain their support. The next paragraph will discuss the findings obtained in the themes that are only available in DSNR's interviews; which are political party affairs and presidential legacy, followed by the themes that are only available in DSAI's interviews; which are foreign affairs and personal issues.

On the theme of political party affairs in DSNR interviews, the pattern of observance and flouting is the flout of the maxims of Manner, Quantity, Relation; followed by the observance of maxims, and then the flout of the maxim of Quality. The flout of the maxim of Manner and Quantity is the most noticeable pattern found in DSNR's interviews on the theme of political party affairs. According to Grice, the maxim of Manner requires a speaker to speak clearly and avoid ambiguity in his/her responses. On the theme of political party affairs, the questions that were asked to DSNR were mostly questions which were related to BN's progress as a political party. This is often evidenced in DSNR's talk when he mentioned and highlighted about the ruling party's contribution to the country's growth in order to divert the audiences' attention onto something else, instead of addressing the main question that requires his

response as the leader of BN. So, the use of *we* as a member of BN is advantageous in this case for it helps him to portray the ruling party as a united and strong party, despite their shortcomings. The least noticeable pattern of flouting in DSNR's interviews on the theme of political party affairs is the flouting of the maxims of Relation and Quality. While there are occurrences of observance of Grice's maxims demonstrated by DSNR when discussing about political party affairs. Then, on the theme of presidential legacy, DSNR seems to be flouting the maxim of Quantity and Manner which can be seen in 1NR Extract 11 and 1NR Extract 12. In this discussion, the use of the personal pronoun *I* as self-assertion and *I* as self-expression is essential in assisting him to strongly present and emphasize his views as the Prime Minister of Malaysia particularly on what he thinks Malaysia will be like in the years to come, whether the country will still be under his administration or someone else's and so forth.

On the theme of foreign affairs in DSAI's interviews, DSAI appears to be observing the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles. This is probably because he is presenting information based on true facts when he shares and expresses his personal views on the social and political issues that are taking place in other countries. The use of the personal pronoun *I* with the verb 'think' and 'believe' is most significant in his talk as he speaks his opinion, as what is claimed by Clayman (as cited in Bramley, 2001, p. 259), politicians use 'I think' when they want to express their agreement or disagreement with assured information and they did it by presenting evaluations based on the knowledge they have about the issue. Adegaju (2014) notes that the use of the personal pronoun *I* with stative verbs such as 'believe', 'feel', and 'think' helps politicians to express their 'private' state of mind as they speak. In his talk, DSAI mentioned a lot about issues taking place in countries such as Burma, Philippines, Indonesia and Thailand, and compared them with what is happening in Malaysia, particularly about the freedom of speech among the their people and the opposition

parties' access to media in these countries. When AI mentioned about the opposition parties not getting equal rights in terms of media access in Malaysia, he is telling the truth, which is further supported in Mustafa K. Anuar's (2005) study which revealed that the media in Malaysia helps to facilitate the ruling party's economic achievements by limiting the access of media for the contesting political parties, which is why the opposition parties stand on issues and policies of economic, political and cultural aspects are hardly heard of by the public, instead, they are portrayed in the most negative light possible by the mainstream media. Lewis (2005) defines the media as a set of relationships of text, procedures, audiences and government. While there are no discussions held on the theme of foreign affairs in DSNR's interviews. Lastly, on the theme of personal issues, DSAI seems to be observing the maxims which can be seen in 1AI Extract 3 and 2AI Extract 8 probably because the discussions on this topic are central to DSAI's personal life and friendship using mostly the personal pronoun *I* in his responses.

Generally, it is observed that the ways in which these politicians respond to the questions mainly depend on the types of questions that they were asked. The findings show that both of them mostly fail to observe the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles when responding to questions on political affairs because most of the questions are concerned with political conflicts and controversies which could pose a 'threat' to their positive face. Therefore, in order to 'get away' or avoid from answering these kinds of questions, they tend to flout the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles on purpose. As agreed by Bull and Fetzer (2006), politicians may secretly avoid giving replies by opting out of Grice's cooperative principle. According to Li (2008), the politicians' goal of flouting certain conversational maxims is not just to generate implicature, but as a linguistic strategy to achieve particular goals, for instance,

sustaining their positive image and the image of the political party or country that they represent.

Table 5.3 and 5.4 presents the overall findings for the pattern of the discourse functions of the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* and the pattern for the observance and flouting of maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles in each of the theme in DSNR's and DSAI's interviews respectively. The patterns of the discourse functions of the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* and the observance or flouting of Grice's maxims are organised from more to less occurrences found in the extracts of each theme.

Table 5.3 Overall findings for DSNR's Interviews

Themes	Discourse Functions of the use of personal pronoun <i>I</i>	Discourse Functions of the use of personal pronoun <i>we</i>	Adherence/Flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles
Political Affairs	1. <i>I</i> as self- expression 2. <i>I</i> as self- assertion 3. <i>I</i> as self-clarification	1. <i>We</i> as a member of BN 2. <i>We</i> as a Malaysian	1.Flouting of Quantity 2.Flouting of Manner 3.Flouting of Relation 4.Flouting of Quality
Governance	1. <i>I</i> as self-assertion 2. <i>I</i> as self-expression 3. <i>I</i> as self-clarification	1. <i>We</i> as a member of BN 2. <i>We</i> as a Malaysian 3.Generic <i>we</i>	1.Flouting of Quantity 2.Flouting of Manner 3.Observance of maxims
Political Party Affairs	1. <i>I</i> as self-assertion 2. <i>I</i> as self-expression	1. <i>We</i> as a member of BN	1.Flouting of Manner 2.Flouting of Quantity 3.Flouting of Relation 4.Observance of maxims 5.Flouting of Quality
Foreign Affairs	-	-	-
Presidential Legacy	1. <i>I</i> as self-assertion 2. <i>I</i> as self-expression	No occurrences of <i>we</i>	1.Flouting of Quantity 2.Flouting of Manner
Personal Issues	-	-	-

Table 5.4 Overall findings for DSAI's Interviews

Themes	Discourse Functions of the use of personal pronoun <i>I</i>	Discourse Functions of the use of personal pronoun <i>we</i>	Adherence/Flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles
Political Affairs	1. <i>I</i> as self-assertion 2. <i>I</i> as self-expression	1. <i>We</i> as a member of PR 2. <i>We</i> as a Malaysian	1. Flouting of Quantity 2. Flouting Quality 3. Observance of maxims 4. Flouting of Relation
Governance	1. <i>I</i> as self-expression 2. <i>I</i> as self-assertion	1. <i>We</i> as a member of PR 2. <i>We</i> as a Malaysian	1. Flouting of Quantity 2. Flouting of Quality 3. Observance of maxims
Political Party Affairs	-	-	-
Foreign Affairs	1. <i>I</i> as self-expression 2. <i>I</i> as self-assertion	1. <i>We</i> as a member of PR 2. <i>We</i> as a Malaysian	1. Flouting of Quantity 2. Observance of maxims
Presidential Legacy	-	-	-
Personal Issues	1. <i>I</i> as self-expression 2. <i>I</i> as self-assertion	1. <i>We</i> to refer to him and JA	1. Observance of maxims

Therefore, as shown in Table 5.3 and 5.4, the accomplishment or the flouting of the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles as demonstrated by DSNR and DSAI are somehow assisted by the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in their discourse through the shift in the speaker's participation status as outlined by Goffman's (1981). The notion of 'footing' is indicated by the shifts in the speakers' participation framework and participation status that are associated to the construction of identity, for instance in an interview, it helps the overhearing audience to identify who the interviewee is talking to the overhearing audience as, for instance, as an individual, as a member of a group they belong to in a way of distancing or affiliating themselves from others (Bramley, 2001). In this study, the shifts in participation status can be seen from the shift in the use of the personal pronoun *I* to the use of the personal pronoun *we* and

vice versa. Bull and Fetzer (2006) claims that politicians made strategic use of personal pronouns in order to evade replying to questions through the strategy of over-inclusion and under-inclusion which can be used to shift responsibilities. The strategy of over-inclusion enables a politician to deflect from self-responsibility to a much larger group, for instance, the use of the personal pronoun *we*; while the use of under-inclusion enables a politician to deflect a larger group responsibility to self, or a much smaller group, for instance, the use of the personal pronoun *I*. According to Bramley (2001), the shifts of footing enable interviewees to construct different ‘selves’ and ‘others’ and achieve different effects in their discourse, hence, serving as an advantage to protect these politicians from any direct attack, especially when they are asked questions that are highly controversial which could tarnished their positive face as political figures.

Apart from that, the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* has helped DSNR and DSAI to accomplish maxims of Grice’s Cooperative Principles mainly in situations where the questions they received provide them with a chance to boost their positive attributes, and promote their political policies by highlighting their contributions in politics and the country’s growth; such as, the types of questions that asked about their political party’s progress as opposed to their opponents, and how they addressed certain social and political issues that they have dealt with in the past, which speaks volumes about their actions and effort as political party leaders. This findings are further supported by Li (2008) who claimed that politicians main concern is to present the best face for themselves and the political party that they represent as it helps to enhance their positive face, in a way that damages their political opponent’s face. Thus, the findings of this study reveal that the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* does not only assist in the flouting of Grice’s Cooperative Principles, but it also helps DSNR and DSAI to observe these principles when addressing the questions asked in political interviews.

5.3 Conclusion

Based on the results obtained from this study, a conclusion can be made: these political interviews show that politicians actively exploit the flexibility of pronominal reference *I* and *we*. This is indicated by the shifts in DSNR's and DSAI's participation status and the shift of footing in order to accomplish and flout of the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles. According to Goffman (1981) the shift in footing can be displayed through a pronoun shift, for instance, when we represent ourselves, we typically use the personal pronoun *I*, however, when we are speaking on behalf of a member of a group or some special association, we present ourselves explicitly or implicitly using the personal pronoun *we*, and not *I* (as cited in Lerner & Kitzinger, 2007).

Firstly, the shifts in the speaker's participation status and change of footing occurrences are signalled through the shift in the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* in the discourse of DSNR and DSAI. The shifts in the use of the pronouns are able to help them in two aspects; firstly, the shift from the pronouns *I* to *we* manage to help them to evade from replying to threatening questions for instance, when they were asked questions about an issue that is classified as confidential or still in the process of investigation – thus, they end up answering the questions in terms of collective *we* instead of taking an individual responsibility by responding using *I*. Consequently, they are able to minimise the threat posed by the questions that could have threatened their positive face.

Secondly, the shift from *we* to *I* is a plus for them to give credit for themselves since the central emphasis of *I* is on self, they are able to highlight their personal involvement, personal actions that they have taken and contributed ever since they were in the arena as well as their personal accomplishments throughout their journey as politicians. Besides that, they are able to express their personal views and thoughts

using the pronoun *I* as self-expression, self-assertion and self-clarification which allow them to reflect their attitude and the way they think to the audience that is manifested through their words when they talk about an issue.

Thirdly, the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* has led them to frequently flouted the maxim of Quantity. Most of the times, when they flout the maxim of Quantity they will end up flouting the maxim of Manner because when they give a lengthy explanation, they usually include a lot of unnecessary information and as a result, their responses turn out to be ambiguous. Basically, the main reason for not complying with the four conversational maxims is because they were avoiding from answering questions that could affect their image as leaders, or their respective political parties' reputation. Alfahad (2015) claims that politicians widely evade answering questions, because of the nature of the conflictual forces which makes them want to avoid many of the questions that they were asked and not because they prefer to equivocate.

Besides assisting DSNR and DSAI in the flouting of maxim of Grice's Cooperative Principles in political interviews, the pronominal shifts have also helped them in the accomplishment of the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principles, which tells you that as a speaker, you should "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", (Grice, 1975, p. 45). DSNR and DSAI are observed to adhere to these maxims when the questions they received enable them to put themselves and the political party they represent, including the members of the party, in the best of light, through the use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we*. The use of the personal pronoun *I* helps them to highlight their personal qualities as politicians and political leaders, while the use of the personal pronoun *we* in their responses helps them to make known of their actions, efforts and contributions in politics as a political party.

To sum up, DSNR and DSAI have strategically made use of the personal pronouns *I* and *we* when giving responses in political interviews as one of the ways to avoid from replying to questions that could negatively affect their image as politicians, as well as the image of the members of their respective parties; and to comply to the questions as what is required by the interviewer as a chance for them to publicise their positive attributes and accomplishments in politics. The study of pronouns in these political interviews gives linguistic evidence that has led to the understanding of the nature of political discourse and helps to inform the audience and make them aware that even when the politicians have answered the questions, there is still a possibility of them hiding the truth from the public (Mehdipour & Nabifar, 2011). The current study shows how talk is formally constructed and how politicians are always trying to make themselves look good and portray their opposition negatively, and in this case, the pronouns are the significant source. Apart from that, the context of questions that they need to respond to also plays a significant role in determining their choice of personal pronouns and their observance to Grice's Cooperative Principles.

5.4 Suggestions for future work

First and foremost, this study is limited in scope. The number of interviews and politicians selected as the data set for this study is a rich group for analysing and identifying common characteristics – specifically the personal pronouns *I* and *we*; and the occurrences of conversational maxims. However, a much larger group of interviews, inclusive of a number of politicians from other countries, would help to widen the scope and perhaps reveal more interesting comparable findings that can broaden and validate a set of defining characteristics for journals or researches. Moreover, since the current study only focuses on the first-person pronouns, extending the analysis to second-person or third-person pronouns by using a different linguistic approach and theoretical framework may help to expand the scope and enhance the findings of the current study which will help to disclose more linguistic evidence that will lead to the emergence of other possible linguistic strategies adopted by these politicians.

References

- Adegoju, A. (2014). Person deixis as discursive practice in Nigeria's "June 12" conflict rhetoric. *Ghana Journal of Linguistics*, 3(1), 45-64. Retrieved in October 20, 2014 from <http://www.ajol.info/index.php/gjl/article/view/107180/97070>
- Alfahad, A. (2015). Equivocation in Arabic news interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. 1-18. Retrieved in May 25, 2015 from <http://jls.sagepub.com/content/35/2/206.full.pdf+html>
- Alfayez, H. (2007). Critical Discourse Analysis of Martin Luther King's Speech "I have a dream". (Unpublished Ph.D's Thesis). King Saud University, Riyadh. Retrieved in May 15, 2015, from <http://faculty.ksu.edu.sa/Alfayez.H/Pages/pragmaticsdiscourseanalysis.aspx>
- Allen, W. (2007) Australian political discourse: Pronominal choice in campaign speeches. *Selected Papers from the 2006 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*. Retrieved in May 8, 2016 from https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:12794/ALLEN_W_ALS2006.pdf
- Atkinson, J. M. & Heritage, J. (1984). *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation. Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Azimah Shurfa Mohammed Shukry. (2013). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Mahathir Mohamad's speeches on the "War on Terror". *Intellectual DIscourse*, 21(2), 171-195. Retrieved in October 23, 2014 from <http://journals.iium.edu.my/intdiscourse/index.php/islam/article/view/552>
- Bev, J.S. (2008, February 20). The Power and Abuse of Language in Politics. The Jakarta Post. Retrieved in August 3, 2015 from <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2008/02/20/power-and-abuse-language-politics.html>
- Boskin, J.M. (2016, June 20). The Problem with Politicians as Historians. Retrieved in April 2014 from <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-presidential-legacy-by-michael-boskin-2016-06>
- Bramley, N. (2001). *Pronouns of politics: the use of pronouns in the construction of 'self' and 'other' in political interviews*. (Unpublished Ph.D's Thesis). Australian National University, Canberra. Retrieved in August 6, 2015 from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.125.4780&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Brozin, M. (2010). The intentions behind Barack Obama's strategic use of personal pronouns. Retrieved in December 18, 2014 from <http://www.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:375134/fulltext01.pdf>
- Bull, P. & Fetzer, A. (2006). Who are we and who are you? The strategic use of forms of address in political interviews. *Text and Talk*, 26(1), 1-35. <https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2006.002>

- Bull, P. (2002). The Microanalysis of Political Discourse. *Philologia Hispalensis*, 26 (1), 79-93. Retrieved in June 5, 2016 from http://institucional.us.es/revistas/philologia/26/art_4.pdf
- Bull, P.(2009). Techniques of political interview analysis. In Álvarez-Benito, G., Fernández-Díaz, G., & Íñigo-Mora, I. (Eds.), *Discourse and Politics*, Chapter 13, 215-228. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Chen L. L. (2007). A study of first person pronouns in Chinese political discourse (Unpublished Master's Dissertation). National Tsing Hua University, Taiwan. Retrieved in July 7, 2016 from <https://www.academia.edu/2946952>
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Chilton, P. & Schäffner, C. (2002). *Politics as text and talk*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Clayman, S. E. (1993). Reformulating the question: a device for answering/not answering in news interviews and press conferences. *Walter de Gruyter*, 13(2), 159-188. Retrieved on February 5, 2015 from <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/clayman/docs/ReformulatingTheQ.pdf>
- David, M.K. (2010) *Leadership Discourse of Tun Dr. Mahathir Mohammad*. Shah Alam: UPENA.
- David, M.K. (2014). Language, Power and Manipulation: The Use of Rhetoric in Maintaining Political Influence. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 5(1), 164-170. Retrieved in July 9, 2015 from <https://www.academia.edu/8833432>
- De Fina (1995). Pronominal choice, identity, and solidarity in political discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21(4), 379–410. doi: 10.1515/text.1.1995.15.3.379
- Fadhly, F. Z. (2012). Flouts of the cooperative principle maxims in SBY'spresidential interviews. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 1(1), 57-70. Retrieved in February 8, 2015 from <https://www.academia.edu/29742312>
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P.Cole and J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hakansson, J. (2012). The Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches. (Unpublished undergraduate dissertation). Linnaeus University, Sweden. Retrieved in December 25, 2015 from <http://www.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:531167/fulltext01.pdf>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

- Hamid M. Al-Hamadi & Behija J. Muhammed. (2009). Pragmatics: Grice's Conversational Maxims Violations in the Responses of Some Western Politicians. *Journal of the College of Arts. University of Basrah*, 50. Retrieved in October 4, 2015 from <http://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=53089>
- Hanlon, B. (2010). Verbal aggression and neutrality in political interviews. *Diffusion: the UCLan Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 3(2), 1-17. Retrieved in March 23, 2014 from <http://atp.uclan.ac.uk/buddypress/diffusion/?p=73>
- Harwood, N. (2007). Political scientists on the functions of personal pronouns in their writing: An interview-based study of 'I' and 'we'. *Text & Talk*, 27(1), 27-54. Retrieved in April 24, 2015 from <http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/95239/1/TEXT%20Article.pdf>
- Hyland, K. (2007). Applying a Gloss: Exemplifying and Reformulating in Academic Discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 266-285. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm011>
- Inigo-Mora, I. (2013). Pronominal Choice as an Interpersonal Strategy. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 3(3), 22-37. Retrieved in November 11, 2016 from http://aijcrnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_3_March_2013/3.pdf
- Jasim Mohammed Hassan, (2011). A Linguistic Analysis of In-group and out-group Pronouns in Hosni Mubarak's Speech. *Journal of Basrah Researches (Humanities Series)*, 38(2), 5-24. Retrieved in June 26, 2016 from <http://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=90135>
- Jena, H. D. (2012). Deixis and demonstratives. *The Semantics-pragmatics Interface*. Retrieved in June 5, 2014 from <http://www.personal.uni-jena.de/~x4diho/Deixis%20and%20demonstratives.pdf>
- Jorgensen, M. & Phillips, L. (2011). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Los Angeles, California.: Sage.
- Koskela, H. (2001). *Topic – Invoked Participation Frameworks in “Talk”- Discussion Programs*. (Unpublished Ph.D's Thesis). University of Jyväskylä, Finland. Retrieved in March 30, 2017 from <https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/7331/heidkosk.pdf?sequence=1>.
- Kuo, S. H. (2002). From solidarity to antagonism: The uses of the second-person singular pronoun in Chinese political discourse. *An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies*, 22(1), 29-55. Retrieved in September 30, 2015 from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.552.9827&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Lerner, G. H. & Kitzinger, C. (2007). Extraction and aggregation in the repair of individual and collective self-reference. *Discourse Studies*, 9(4), 526-557. Retrieved in March 20, 2017 from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1461445607079165>
- Lewis, J. (2005). *Language Wars*. London: Pluto.

- Li, S. (2008). A Performative Perspective of Flouting and Politeness in Political Interview. *Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, 5(2), 32-47. Retrieved in October 11, 2015 from http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL12/pdf_doc/3.pdf
- Mehdipour, F. & Nabifar, N. (2011). Critical analysis of evasion techniques in American political news interviews. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies*, 1(5), 56-70. Retrieved on July 28, 2014 from <http://www.academians.org/articles/december5.pdf>
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, M.A. (1994). *Qualitative Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage
- Mustafa K. Anuar (2005). Politics and the Media in Malaysia. *Kasarinlan: Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, 20(1), 25-47. Retrieved in May 19, 2016 from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.968.3160&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Nakaggwe, L. (2012). The persuasive power of personal pronouns in Barack Obama's rhetoric. (unpublished undergraduate dissertation). Linnaeus University, Sweden. Retrieved in November 17, 2015 from <http://www.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:600522/FULLTEXT02>
- Okamura, A. (2009). Use of Personal Pronouns in Two Types of Monologic Academic Speech. *The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics*. 52(1), 17-26. Retrieved in February 8, 2015 from http://www1.tcue.ac.jp/home1/kgakkai/ronsyuu/ronsyuukeisai/52_1/okamura.pdf
- Oliver, D.G., Serovich, J.M. & Mason T.L. (2005). Constraints and Opportunities with Interview Transcription: Towards Reflection in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Social Forces*, 84 (2), 1273-1289. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2006.0023>
- Orwell, G. (1968). *Politics and The English Language*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javanovich.
- Putri, N.A. & Kurniawan, E. (2015). Person Deixis in USA Presidential Campaign Speeches. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 3(2), 190-200. Retrieved in August 12, 2015 from <https://www.academia.edu/22418876>
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Rozina, G. & Karapetjana, I. (2009). The Use of Language in Political Rhetoric: Linguistic Manipulation . *Journal of Social Sciences*, 36. Retrieved in May 23, 2016, from <http://sdu.dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/117981>
- Saj, H. E. (2012). Discourse Analysis: Personal Pronouns in Oprah Winfrey Hosting Queen Rania of Jordan. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 2(6), 529-532. doi: 10.7763/IJSSH.2012.V2.163
- Taguchi, N. & Sykes, J. M. (2013). *Technology in Interlanguage pragmatics research and teaching*. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Pub. Co

- Tarrosy, I. (2015). Political Culture in a Glocal Perspective. Retrieved in August 1, 2016 from http://tarrosy.hu/application/document/download/1487167600_d1fb42e9840791e2f7272dab646b544c/PoliticalCultureTextbook_Tarrosy_2015.pdf
- Vizcaíno Ortega, F. (1996). The pragmatic dimension of personal pronouns. *The Philologica Canariensis: Revista de filología de la Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria*, 2(3), 397-414. Retrieved in August 11, 2015 from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Francisco_Vizcaino-Ortega/publication/44226302
- Wulan Rahayu. (2012). *The Realization of Grice's Cooperative Principle in Obama Exclusive RCTI Bersama Putra Nababan*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Universiti Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung. Retrieved in February 21, 2014 from download.portalgaruda.org/article.php?article=69176&val=4866
- Yule, G. (2006). *The Study of Language*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Zand-Moghadam, A. & Bikineh, L. (2015). Discourse Markers in Political Interviews: A Contrastive Study of Persian and English. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 3(1), 48-61. Retrieved in February 2, 2017 from http://www.ijscel.net/pdf_6756_b9e936095c164ee7e5d72a32418d5573.html