ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS AND ADVERSARIAL QUESTIONING IN POST-MATCH INTERVIEWS

STIPPIE CHEE WEI HOW

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS (LINGUISTICS)

FACULTY OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR

2018

UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA

ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION

Name of Candidate: STIPPIE CHEE WEI HOW

Matric No: TGC130044

Name of Degree: MASTER OF LINGUISTICS

Title of Dissertation ("this Work"): ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS AND ADVERSARIAL QUESTIONING IN POST-MATCH INTERVIEWS

Field of Study: PRAGMATICS

 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: DR THILAGAVATHI SHANMUGANATHAN

Designation: SENIOR LECTURER

ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS AND ADVERSARIALQUESTIONING IN POST-MATCH INTERVIEWS

ABSTRACT

The advancement of journalism technology has seen the introduction of broadcast interviews, which often feature unscripted questioning and answering between journalists and interviewees. Over the years, studies of adverseness in interviews have been focusing mostly on political interviews, with other types of interview such as entertainment and sports explored limitedly. This study aims to investigate the effects of match outcome on what kind of illocutionary acts and how they are used by Jose Mourinho, as well as the adverseness used in the journalists' questioning and how they are used against Jose Mourinho by adopting Searle's Classification of Illocutionary Acts (1976) and Clayman's Question Analysis System (2002) as analytical frameworks. Classification of Jose Mourinho's utterances is based on illocutionary point, direction of fit and psychological condition identification, while adverseness in the interviewers' questions is analysed by identifying the adverseness indicators. The representative utterances were aimed at collecting the Portuguese manager's opinions of the match, which also explains why no declarations were used. The use of directives in defeat/draw matches were used only to avoid certain questions from having to be answered, while such directives were not needed when matches were won. The use of suggestive questions by the interviewers shows their approach to "obtain" answers when matches were won. However, questions were more hostile and persistent with their follow-up questions when matches were lost/drawn. Finally, more indirectness were found after matches were lost/drawn which shows the interviewers' cautious approach to ask questions regarding refereeing decisions.

Keywords: Illocutionary acts Classification, Question Analysis System, Jose Mourinho, Post-match Interviews, Adversarial Questioning

ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS AND ADVERSARIALQUESTIONING IN POST-MATCH INTERVIEWS
ABSTRAK

Kemajuan teknologi kewartawanan telah memberi ruang kepada kemunculan temu bual siaran yang sering memaparkan soalan dan jawapan spontan wartawan dan interviewi. Selama ini, kajian keseteruan dalam wawancara telah memberi tumpuan kebanyakannya pada temu bual politik, manakala konteks seperti hiburan dan sukan diterokai secara terhad. Oleh itu, kajian ini bertujuan mengkaji kesan keputusan perlawanan bola sepak pada tindak ilokusi Jose Mourinho, serta keseteruan dalam soal-siasat wartawan dengan merujuk kepada rangka-rangka kerja seperti klasifikasi tindak ilokusi Searle (1976) dan sistem analisa soalan Clayman (2002). Klasifikasi respons Jose Mourinho adalah berdasarkan tujuan ilokusi, halatuju muatan dan psikologi, manakala keseteruan dalam soalan wartawan adalah dikenal pasti dengan merujuk kepada petunjuk-petunjuk yang dikemukan oleh Clayman. Dominasi tindak representatif dalam kajian adalah disebabkan oleh kebanyakan soalan yang bertujuan untuk mengetahui pendapat-pendapat Mourinho. Soalan-soalan semikian juga menyebabkan jawapan-jawapan deklarasi tidak diperlukan. Penggunaan jawapan-jawapan direktif dalam perlawanan kalah/seri sahaja pula menjelaskan bagaimana jawapan-jawapan beliau sentiasa di bawah pengaruh keputusan perlawanan. Kajian juga menunjukkan penemu duga gemar menggunakan soalan-soalan tempelan dalam perlawanan yang dimenangi, manakala penyoalan mereka bersifat lebih seteru dalam temu bual perlawanan kalah/seri dengan penggunaan soalan-soalan susulan. Akhir sekali, penggunaan soalan-soalan tersirat turut menunjukkan kewaspadaan apabila soalan-soalan kontroversi mengenai keputusan pengadil dikemukakan.

Kata Kunci: klasifikasi Tindak Ilokusi, Sistem Analisa Soalan, Jose Mourinho, Temu-bual Selepas Perlawanan, Soal Siasat Seteru

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ARS   :   Arsenal

AST   :   Aston Villa

BPL   :   Barclays Premiere League

BBC   :   British Broadcasting Corporation

BUR   :   Burnley

CHE   :   Chelsea

CRP   :   Crystal Palace

EVE   :   Everton

F.A Cup   :   Football Association Challenge Cup

FC   :   Football Club

HKSAR   :   Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

HUL   :   Hull City

JM   :   Jose Mourinho

LCT   :   Leicester City

LIV   :   Liverpool

MCT   :   Manchester City

MUT   :   Manchester United

NYFC   :   New York City Football Club

NEW   :   Newcastle United

PFA   :   Professional Footballers' Association

QPR   :   Queens Park Rangers

QAS   :   Question Analysis System

SHT   :   Southampton

STK   :   Stoke City

SUN	:	Sunderland
SWA	:	Swansea City
TV	:	Television
TOT	:	Tottenham Hotspur
UAV	:	Unmanned aerial vehicle
WBA	:	West Bromwich Albion
WHU	:	West Ham United

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The first chapter of this present research begins by presenting some background information that is important for the understanding of this research: (1) television interviews, (2) post-match interviews and (3) the research subject, Jose Mourinho. The research issue and problem are stated in section 1.2. Last but not least, section 1.3 presents the aims and goals that this research intends to fulfill by answering two research questions that are shown in this section. Limitations are discussed in section 1.4. Lastly, this chapter will be concluded in section 1.5.

1.1   Background Information

As the present research's goal is to examine the interviewers' questioning techniques and Jose Mourinho's responses, it is fundamental for some background information to be introduced and understood beforehand. The following are three sub-sections consisting of television interviews, post-match interviews, and Jose Mourinho.

1.1.1   Television Interviews

The development and advancement of journalism technology has seen the introduction of broadcast interviews. As cable television became available, so did television interviews. Such interviews often see a public figure featured and questioned by a journalist, with the whole session of questioning and answering aired and broadcast for the viewing of the audience. The popularity and acceptance of such interaction has contributed to the decline of traditional and narrative interviewing style. Since then, communicative interviews such as press conferences, talk shows and news interviews have been gathering enormous positive feedback and the demands were high. According to Clayman (2004), these forms of media events are similar, in which unscripted or spontaneous interactions are often featured. Interviewees could be the likes of well-known public figures, famous celebrities to ordinary people.

According to Schmidt et al., (2012), there are various types of television interviews. Interviews about current events are often associated with obtaining information on the latest news issues or development about an ongoing event. Other than interviewing for daily news events, interviewers can also engage opinion-makers to obtain their opinions and views on a certain issue, the opinions are then analysed and examined thoroughly and critically. Last but not least, there are also interviews featuring persons of interest. In such, interviewees often consist of individuals or public figures whom the audiences are interested in knowing, as featuring interviewees such as these often shapes the direction of the interviews to be either emotional or entertaining.

On the question of "in what manner should interviewers confront their interviewees?", Schmidt et al. (2012) underlined the importance of proper questioning and answering time, as interviewers are not supposed to rival their interviewees for airtime. As Clayman (2002) pointed out, a neutral television interview sees a proper, turn-based questioning and answering being carried out. Violation of this rule is considered an initiative move by the interviewer – a move which Clayman considered adversarial in the practise of turn-based interviewing. Over the years, studies of adverseness in interviews have been focusing mostly on political interviews, with other types of interview such as entertainment and sports explored limitedly. At such rate, it is easy for assumptions that adversarial interviewing only occur in interviews featuring politicians to arise. Realizing such a void left unexplored in today's existing research, this study aims to contribute its research findings to fulfill such a research gap by exploring the practice of adversarial interviewing and responses in television sports interview, particularly in the context of post-match interviews in the Barclays Premier League (BPL). The next sub-section explains the role and functions of post-match interviews.

1.1.2   Post-match Interviews

The Barclays Premiere League (BPL) is regarded as one of the most sought after football leagues in the world, featuring many well-known and famous football players across the globe. Twenty teams in the Premiere League play each other (home and away) for a total of thirty-eight matches per season. Points are accumulated based on the match outcome: three points are awarded to the winning team, one point is awarded for both teams should matches finish with a tie; lastly, the defeated team will not be rewarded points. The team which accumulates the most points wins the league championship at the end of the season. At the end of the matches, journalists are often seen approaching their targeted interviewees (footballers or coaching staff) for a quick and brief interview session regarding the match played a while ago.

File (2012) pointed out that post-match interviews can be considered an obligatory journalism practise in any broadcast sporting event. In the context of post-match interviews in the Barclays Premier League, football players, player of the day (also known as man-of-the-match) or coaching staff are interviewed after the matches have ended. However, despite being a prominent research area as it is, post-match interviews have received limited coverage by researchers. Studies of language use in post-match interviews could be worth researching, as verbal conflicts between journalists and footballers or coaching staff tend to happen, which could be possibly caused by interviewers' use of offensive language or adversarial interviewing.

These post-match interviews, in a pragmatic point of view, provide an appropriate platform to conduct studies on illocutionary acts performed by managers, as well as the extent of adverseness in the interviewers' questioning, since during interviews, conversation takes place which means discourses are exchanged between the interviewers and coaching staff. When being interviewed, coaches or managers usually

perform illocutionary acts such as praising (the players), blaming/complaining (the referee) and thanking (the supporters/fans) depending on the situations. This research sees the importance of different match outcomes in influencing Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary act as well as the football journalists' adversarial questioning.

With the discussion of the post-match interviews done, the next sub-section briefly discusses about Jose Mourinho, the subject for this present research.

1.1.3   Jose Mourinho

Jose Mario dos Santos Mourinho Felix or better known as Jose Mourinho (will be referred as Jose Mourinho hereinafter), was the first team coach of Chelsea Football Club on two separate occasions. He achieved successes in coaching teams such as Uniao De Leiria, Benfica and Porto in his native homeland before making his first appearance in English football by accepting the appointment as Chelsea's first team coach. During his first three-year tenure at Chelsea, The Portuguese manager guided the West London club to two Premier League trophies in two consecutive years, two League Cups, one Community Shield and one F.A Cup. He left Chelsea in September 2007 and was replaced by Avram Grant. After his short hiatus away from coaching, he accepted the appointment to become Inter Milan's first team coach and guided the Italian team to Seria A titles twice in two consecutive years, one Coppa Italia trophy, one Supercoppa Italiana and the most prestigious trophy in European football in his third year with the Milan-based club – the Uefa Champions League trophy. His successful three-year coaching tenure then attracted Real Madrid to offer him an opportunity to coach the Spanish club, which is considered the biggest club in European football along with Barcelona FC. In his three-year stay in Madrid, the Portuguese manager guided the Spanish club to the Copa del Rey in 2011, the La Liga trophy in season 2011/2012 and a Supercopa de Espana trophy in his third year with the Madrid-

based club. The Portuguese manager left Spanish football in 2012 and returned to English football to become the first team coach of Chelsea for the second time. In his second appointment, he helped Chelsea to win the Premier League and League Cup trophies in the 2014/2015 season, before he was dismissed due to a string of bad results in his final year coaching the West London club. He currently coaches Manchester United, succeeding his predecessor who is also his mentor, Louis Van Gaal.

Apart from his coaching ability and his tactical knowledge in football which has made him one of the greatest coaches in professional football at present, he is also seen as the "mind game master" by football fans, football pundits and writers. This study explores the "mind games" played by Jose Mourinho, as well as the interviewers' questioning which trigger his "mind games". To attempt this, the definition of mind games should be understood first by reviewing some selected quotes from different football writers.

"*Mourinho has proven himself to be a master manipulator; carefully choosing his words in every post-match interview or press conference in an attempt to influence referees, cast doubts over opposition managers or to shape the media agenda to suit his own narrative.*" – James Milim-Ashmore, football writer, *cited from Jose Mourinho and the Problem of Siege Mentality*, 2015.

"*The fact that Jose has always been a character in the media makes us think that all he says are part of his mind games.*" – Aditya Lahoti, Sports writer, *cited from Jose Mourinho – Still the Special One?*, 2013.

"Whether it's consciously calculated, which is a strong possibility, or whether it's an emotional response, which is also a strong possibility, Mourinho has, time and time again, shown a siege mentality with his teams, by creating common enemies." – Andy Barton, mental performance coach, cited from *Mourinho Mind Games are a Tactic to Invoke Siege Mentality Among Chelsea Players*, 2014.

Based on the quotes above, the researcher's explanation of Jose Mourinho's mind games is the manager's "carefully-planned, strategically selected words to help him achieve his goals", which, to a certain extent, similar to Searle's (1976) classification of illocutionary acts into categories of human linguistic communication, which can be understood as uses of different types of speeches to reach certain goals by the speakers. Bach (1994) views illocutionary acts as speakers' intentions to communicate something to the hearer. Such views coincide with Jose Mourinho's mind games or his controversial utterances in his interviews or press conferences to help him achieve certain goals. In fact, the controversies he created during his tenure at Chelsea are often considered "deliberate" and "done with a purpose" to divert the media's attention away from Chelsea's poor run of match results. Examples of his controversial quotes are calling Arsene Wenger, the manager of Arsenal FC a "specialist in failure" (Cited from *Arsene Wenger is a "Specialist in Failure" – Jose Mourinho*, BBC, 2014.) for his failure to guide his club to a single trophy between 2005 - 2015 and describing Sam Allardyce's tactic as "nineteenth century football" after Chelsea was denied a victory by Allardyce's West Ham United, a match which Jose Mourinho claimed the opposition "did nothing other than defending" (Cited from *Jose Mourinho: Chelsea Boss says West Ham's Style is 19th Century*, BBC, 2014).

Apart from Jose Mourinho's controversial responses, interviewers' questioning which led to his controversial responses will also be looked at. For example, the former Chelsea coach happened to ask a journalist to "google for the answer" because he thought the question asking about him not staying more than three years at the clubs he had coached before as "*too stupid*" (Cited from *Jose Mourinho Tells Journalists: "Google instead of Asking Stupid Questions"*, The Guardian, 2015). He also walked out of the conference room and refused to continue the press conference in 2013 when he was asked about his decision to not select Kevin De Bryune in his squad to play against the Romanian champion, Steaua Bucharest, as he answered the journalist and his colleagues had been "*focusing too much*" on that issue and ignored his other players who had performed well (Cited from *Jose Mourinho Angered by Questions over Chelsea Forward Kevin De Bruyne*, Skysports, 2013). Interviewers' questioning which caused Jose Mourinho's reactions such as above is worthy as a research topic as research findings in this area would certainly contribute to fill the unexplored research gap of adversarial interviewing in the context of professional football in England.

In other words, the rationale of selecting Jose Mourinho's use of "mind games" in his interviews to achieve his goals and the interviewers' use of adverseness in their interviewing is the research potential of these ideas and their suitability to be analysed using Searle's illocutionary acts (1976) and Clayman's Question Analysis System (2002).

1.2   Statement of Problem

The match outcome has been identified as the area of concern, which is seen as the research variables to make this research a comparative study, this research hopes to solve an issue of "How does winning, losing or drawing a match affect Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts patterns and the adverseness in the interviewers' questioning?"

The verbal conflicts between Premier League managers and journalists in post-match interviews are not uncommon or unheard of. For example, Nigel Pearson, the former Leicester City's manager once called a reporter "an ostrich" after claiming he was pretending to be unaware of the criticisms surrounding Leicester City (Cited from *Nigel Pearson's Rant in Full: Leicester's Manager "Ostrich" Outburst*, The Guardian, 2015). David Moyes, the former Manchester United manager threatened a female journalist that she might "get a slap" when he was asked if he was feeling stressful over his position after a string of bad performances (Cited from *David Moyes could Face FA Punishment for Telling Reporter She might "Get a Slap"*, The Guardian, 2017). Both cases of managers refusing to answer, or being evasive in answering the journalists' questions came after their teams were defeated. As a result, such coincidence has prompted this present study to be conducted in order to find out whether Jose Mourinho would respond in a similar manner in answering some of the adversarial questions when matches were won instead of lost/drawn.

In other words, the research issue (match outcome) has prompted the researcher into investigating the patterns of adversarial questioning used by the football journalists as well as Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in answering the questions.

1.3   Research Aims and Objectives

This study aims to investigate the effects of match outcome on what kind of strategies are used (illocutionary acts), and how they are used (utterance patterns) by Jose Mourinho, as well as what kind of adverseness are used in the journalists' questioning (types/dimensions of adverseness), and how they are used against Jose Mourinho (pattern of adverseness). In order to achieve the said research aims/goals, this present study is designed to answer the following research questions:

a) What are the illocutionary acts used by Jose Mourinho after matches?

Understanding that interviewees' responses are influenced by journalists' adversarial questioning to a certain extent during media interviews, the researcher does not only classify and categorise Jose Mourinho's utterances into different classes of illocutionary acts, but also looks at the manner of questioning by the football journalists, thus, another research question has been set as follows:

b) How does the interviewers' adversarial questioning influence Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts?

1.4   Limitations

Though this study is able to be completed, it is not one without limitations. First and foremost, the research subject, Jose Mourinho alone is unable to represent the whole community of all managers coaching in England. This is because different managers will surely behave differently and will respond differently when it comes to being interviewed after matches. In other words, it is impossible to assume that Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts represents the way his colleagues and coaching counterparts use illocutionary acts in their post-match interviews.

Secondly, the data used for this research, is only limited to Jose Mourinho's post-match interviews in season 2014/2015. Such setting limits the understanding of Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts within the mentioned time frame only, instead of the Portuguese manager's whole managerial career so far. As mentioned in the first chapter, Jose Mourinho's coaching tenure in England is divided into three periods; his first coaching experience with Chelsea from 2004 to mid-2007, his return to English club football management with Chelsea from 2013 to mid-2016, and his present coaching position with Manchester United. With Youtube.com constantly updating the post-match interview videos, some of the Portuguese manager's older post-match interviews, to those from the 2004 to mid-2007 period, were no longer available. It was also not possible for the researcher to include the post-match interviews he featured as the current coach of Manchester United, as the season was still ongoing by the time this research is being conducted. As a result, the researcher's option is limited to the ones in season 2014/2015, as the videos are still available to be accessed and downloaded. The researcher's deficiency in languages such as Spanish, Portuguese and Italian also limits the selection of post-match interviews where Jose Mourinho spoke in English only, as the researcher lacks the fluency to interpret post-match interviews where the mentioned languages were spoken. Such limitation in research data selection also results in this research of limiting Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in English only, with his illocutionary utterances in Portuguese, Italian and Spanish could not be studied. As the researcher agrees with Wardhaugh (2006) that language usage is determined by language structures.

Last but not least, the research is also unable to tell whether Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in the abovementioned time frame was, to a certain extent, influenced by the journalists' personal biasness towards him or not. As mentioned in the first chapter, coaches and managers are not the only ones that are treated with

adversarialness when they are interviewed. In fact, evasiveness by interviewees such as verbally attacking the interviewers or insulting the interviewers (Bull & Mayer, 1993) is common and not unheard of. With Jose Mourinho also one of the managers who had attempted such evasiveness, it is not illogical to suggest that he was only questioned adversarially out of professional questioning but not due to personal biasness and disliking.

1.5   Conclusion

The first chapter sees the researcher briefly introduced television interviews, post-match interviews and the subject for this research – Jose Mourinho. The researcher also identified different match outcomes (win, defeat/draw) as the issue which prompted the researcher into investigating the patterns of adverseness in the interviewers' questioning as well as Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in answering the questions. Lastly, the research also listed two research questions to be answered in order to fulfill the research aim, which is to investigate the effect of match outcome on Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts and the questioning adverseness of football journalists.

Before the present research continues to the analysis phase, some related existing research works are to be reviewed in the next chapter to not only show some of the main published research works that are relevant and how they are useful as frameworks to this research, but also how this research could contribute by fulfilling some of the voids and gaps that are yet to be explored so far in today's existing research works.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1   Introduction

The second chapter of this present study begins with an introduction to Austin's speech act theory in section 2.2, followed by Searle's criticisms of some of the weaknesses in his mentor's theory in section 2.3. In acknowledging the importance of interviewers' questions and interviewees' responses in studies of media interviews, sections 2.4 and 2.5 will focus on presenting some of the related literature in both of these domains. In section 2.6 and 2.7, a number of studies related to the use of illocutionary acts in interviews and some language studies in football will also be presented. The researcher will also reveal some of the research gaps which this study intends to fill in section 2.8. Lastly, this chapter will be concluded in section 2.9.

2.2   Austin's Speech Act Theory (1962)

The speech act theory was first introduced by J.L Austin when he proposed that for decades, people had been assuming that the role of speech is no more than fact-stating and affair-describing, with the statements either "true" or "false" (Austin, 1962). He then wondered if language could perform tasks by raising a question about the possibility of "can saying make it so?" The question then prompted him to divide sentences into "performatives" and "constatives", which was also the earliest stage of the speech act theory.

Constative sentences describe propositional content that can be ascribed with either "true" or "false" (Austin, 1962), examples of constative include statements, rumours, or claims (Searle, 1971). On the other hand, performative sentences, according to Austin, serve neither to report nor describe, and are neither true nor false. What performative sentences achieve is that once uttered, they perform an action to a certain extent, if not fully (Austin, 1962).

Examples of performative sentences are shown below:

a) I shall name this boy "Tarzan".

b) I hereby pronounce you husband and wife.

c) You have been charged with murder for the killing of Alex Murphy.

d) You are fired.

One similarity shared by the examples above is that they are not uttered to describe the speaker's act of uttering, but are uttered to perform an action with effect. For example, the boy in sentence (a) will be called "Tarzan" from the day of the naming onwards, while the couple in sentence (b) will officially become husband and wife to each other. The murderer of Alex Murphy in sentence (c) can only be guilty after being sentenced by the judge. Lastly, the employee's position in sentence (d) can be removed after being told so by his employer. However, for the events to take place after uttering the above sentences, Austin claimed that several conditions need to be met. For example, certain words must be uttered by the "correct" and "sincere" persons, in a setting which meets the performance of the act. In other words, for the couple in sentence (b) to be officially married to each other, the words "husband" and "wife" must be uttered by a pastor, not an imposter without the sincerity condition to administer the marriage; and lastly, it has to be in a setting none other than a wedding ceremony. According to Austin (1962), any violation of the mentioned felicitous conditions, cause the performance of a speech act to "misfire".

Realizing that Austin's proposal of constative and performative was doubtful in terms of utterance categorization, Searle (1976) later proposed that the idea of performative be isolated, due to his understanding of the difficulty of recognizing constatives and performatives, which, according to Searle, was not easy for both to appear to be interrelated. In other words, constatives could, to a certain extent, serve to

perform acts of informing, telling, or defining. For example, when pointing out direction to a certain place, the act of directing is not performed for nothing, but adds to the hearer's information and understanding.

Searle (1976) further argued that the fact constatives can be made into performatives through grammatical means makes it more difficult to separate these two categories. An example is to add "*hereby declare*" to any constative utterances for the transformation to take place. In other words, the constative "*I play football*" can be made a declaration "*I hereby declare that I play football*" without changing the meaning of both sentences.

To counter Searle's argument, there were two alternatives taken by Austin. The first was introducing the concept of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary act, with locutionary divided into two subcategories consisting of illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Leech (1983: 199) had a distinctive understanding in defining these three types of act. He claimed that locutionary act refers to the act of saying something; illocutionary act refers to the act that is performed upon saying something and perlocutionary act refers to the effects that the speaker intends to achieve upon saying something. For example, in the sentence "*can you prepare dinner tonight?*", the locutionary act is the question uttered by the speaker to the hearer; the illocutionary act refers to a request made by the speaker. Lastly, the perlocutionary act refers to the effect/outcome that the speaker wants to achieve, which is the preparation of dinner by the hearer.

Understanding that illocutionary acts are considered the core of the speech act theory, and to prevent overlapping of utterance categories as Searle pointed out, Austin proceeded to list a five-category illocutionary act classification system. The five categories are verdictives, exercitives, commissives, behabitives and expositives.

Classification of utterances is based on the goal that a speaker aims to achieve when something is uttered.

Verdictive utterances serve to deliver "verdicts". According to Oishi (2006), verdictives utterances are used to express "judgments" or "verdicts" by the speaker. One example of such utterance is the act of calling a boxing match over by a referee. The content of such utterances can be assessed as "true" or "false" depending on the hearer's understanding of the speaker's judgement (Austin, 1962).

Exercitives are used to exercise authority or power by the speaker. Examples of exercitives are utterances which serve to appoint, direct and order (Alvarez, 2005:685-702). As mentioned before, to prevent an exercitive act from "misfiring", the performer of the act must hold certain authority. For example, to assign someone to a certain position in an organization, the act of appointing needs to be performed by the executive director.

Commissive utterances are the ones that are uttered when the speaker shows his/her obligation to carry out certain acts in the future (Masaki, 2004). Performative verbs under this category include promise, pledge and undertake.

To express the speaker's moods, attitude and behaviour, behabitive utterances are used (Culpeper & Semino, 2000). Since the propositional content expresses "social behaviours", the term "behabitive" is used to name the members of this class. Behabitives include congratulate, praise and condole.

Lastly, expositives are utterances with performatives that are made explicit to shape how an utterance is understood (Björgvinsson, 2011). One example is the use of the performative verb "declare" when making a declaration of "*I hereby declare that…*"

With Austin's speech act theory briefly introduced, the next section looks at Searle's Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts as he introduced his own illocutionary act classification system based on the five categories of illocutionary act introduced by Austin mentioned in the previous section.

2.3   Searle's Criticisms of Austin's Classification of Illocutionary Acts

Searle (1976) began his taxonomy with the question "How many ways can language be used?", prompting question marks on what constitutes language use in human communication. He then continued by asking "How many types of illocutionary acts can be found in human communication?" after declaring his belief that illocutionary acts are the basic units of human language communication. The introduction of his own classification was very much due to some of the weaknesses he identified in Austin's classification system which are as follow:

a) Austin's confusion in differentiating illocutionary acts and illocutionary verbs − There were many cases in Austin's illocutionary act classification system that "the manner of the performance of acts" was assumed by as "acts". One example, as Searle pointed out was the illocutionary verb "announce" in Austin's classification system. According to Searle, the verb "announce" is different from acts such as "promise", "order" and "state", as these acts can be expressed by the use of an "announcement", but never does the verb "announce" be considered an "act".

b) Not all the classified verbs are illocutionary verbs − What Austin classified under the five categories seemed like illocutionary verbs. In fact, not all the verbs are illocutionary verbs. Such examples are "shall", "mean to", "regard as" and "intend". Searle further elaborated that "one can show intentions by using

different illocutionary acts. However, intending cannot be considered as an illocutionary act."

c) Lack of principles in illocutionary act classification - Apart from commissive, which Austin clearly stated is a category with members to commit a speaker to performing a certain task, the rest of the categories, particularly behabitive, was a category that still needed "further clarification" according to Austin.

d) Overlapping between members from one category to another – Due to a lack of principle in classification of the performatives, members under a certain category are often exposed to a possibility of being classified under "two or more categories". Searle's criticism comes from Austin's definition of the categories. Take verdictive (serves to deliver "verdicts") and expositive (utterances with explicit performatives to make speaker's meanings known) for example, it is not easy to tell apart the exposition "*I hereby declare the end of today's meeting*" and the verdictive "*the meeting has ended*".

e) Questionable classification – In some categories there exist some performative verbs that should not be classified under the particular category at all. Take the examples of performative verbs such as "challenge" and "dare", which are classified under the behabitives category, the same category as "apologize" and "thank". The former two acts which to a certain extent, influence the hearer into performing certain tasks the speaker intended in his challenging act, do not seem to be appropriate being classified together with the latter two acts, which express the speaker's psychological condition.

f) Failure definition of acts – Searle commented that not all the verbs' are well defined. Take the verbs "appoint" and "nominate" for examples, both verbs are grouped together as Austin defined them as acts which "made decisions are due to favouring or opposing particular course of action". In the case of appointing a chairperson, the act "appoint" does not "advocate" the appointment of someone as the chairperson but "makes" someone a chairperson.

(Cited from Searle (1976), *A Classification of Illocutionary Acts*, Language in Society, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-23.)

With the weaknesses in Austin's classification system listed out, Searle remodeled his mentor's taxonomy and introduced his own. He concluded that there should be only five categories of illocutionary acts which constitutes the use of human language. Searle's own 5-category taxonomy of illocutionary act classification will be presented in the next chapter's research framework section.

2.4 Adverseness in Interview Questioning

Topics on adversarial questioning techniques are not new or unheard of. In fact, they have been widely studied and discussed by researchers and scholars for the past few decades. According to Greenbatch (1998), the upholding of neutralism in media interviews has changed to a certain degree over time. As interviewers are allowed more freedom in questioning their interviewees, a particular style has emerged and defied the concept of "neutral journalism", a style which Greenbatch termed as "adversarial interviewing".

Prior to the emergence of topics of adversarial interviewing, the concept of journalistic conduct had been understood in a way where interviewers have certain standards to adhere to. According to Clayman & Heritage (2002), interviewers are expected to practice neutralism by taking a "neutral, impartial and balanced" stance

when conducting interviews. With broadcast interviews gaining popularity, there had been an observed increase in the tendency of interviewers "taking over" to gain the upper hand in interviews by manipulating their questioning manner, claiming to prevent their interviewees from giving "evasive" answers. Such a phenomenon later gave rise to talking points such as interview aggressiveness or adversarial questioning.

Clayman and Heritage are the most well-known scholars in this area. Both researchers have numerous times collaborated to study adversarial interviewing by applying different research design. Their combined study (2002) came to a conclusion that the beginning of such questioning style emerged in the 1950s, which later paved the way for an increase of interview adverseness in recent years most notably in British and American news/press conferences. The cause of such changes, according to both researchers, was very much related to an undergoing of environmental shift in broadcast journalism politically, economically and institutionally. As how journalism in a particular timeline is portrayed reflects the larger socio-historical context in that period of time (Schudson, 1982; Mancini et. al., 1984), the interaction between interviewers and interviewees in broadcast interviews, in a general sense, also tells of the developments of national politics and journalism. For example, a study conducted by Yip (2003) on interview shows in Hong Kong has pointed out that interviewers approached their interviewees in a rather aggressive manner. Coincidentally, in the similar time period, political unrest hit Hong Kong when 7% of the city's total population, around half a million of Hong Kong citizens, protested against the performance of the HKSAR (Hong Kong Special Administrative Region) government led by the former Hong Kong Chief Executive Tung Chee-hwa.

Apart from Yip's (2003) study, other researchers also paved the way for studies of adversarial interviewing featuring politicians and election candidates as interviewees,

such as Robinson (1976) and Clayman & Heritage (2002). However, interview adverseness has proven to be difficult to be calculated and quantified. Schudson (1995) suggested that it is difficult to measure civility in his study of the Watergate impact on American journalism. Other researchers include Smith (1990) and Kernell (1986), who pointed out that interview adverseness is considered "elusive", and although it is possible to illustrate it anecdotally, systematic evidence proving such phenomenon are "extremely limited and rare".

In accordance with studies involving adversarial interviewing on politicians and election candidates, Clayman & Heritage (2002) introduced the Question Analysis System (QAS) in their comparative study on press conferences featuring former U.S presidents Eisenhower and Reagan. The system divides interview adverseness into four dimensions, namely initiative, directness, assertiveness and hostility, with a particular set of indicators classified under each dimension (*initiative – question cascades, question complexity and follow-up questions; directness – self-referencing question frames and other-referencing question frames; assertiveness – preface tilt and suggestive questions; hostility – global hostility, preface hostility and accountability questions*). The final results show Reagan receiving more adverseness in all indicators compared to Eisenhower in the press conferences, indicating an increased level of initiative, directness, assertiveness and hostility in the question design. At the end of the study, both researchers concluded that the causes of the rising of adverseness in press conference over time was very much unknown, as only two historical timelines were studied, referring to the periods during the Watergate incident and the Vietnam war.

The QAS was later applied by many other researchers in their studies on adversarial interviewing. Sun's (2005) research concluded that even in the interviewing culture in a Chinese context known for showing respect and giving their interviewees as

much comfort as possible, adverseness in interviewing still managed to find its way. Chinese interviewers showed their aggressiveness through their complex and target-like questioning style, with both styles reaching 73% and 52% respectively of the total questions asked. Figures for all ten indicators also suggested similar outcome, namely, foreign interviewers tend to show more aggressiveness compared to Chinese interviewers, as the results revealed that questions on accountability issues were mostly raised by foreign interviewers. Sun suggested that the occurrence of such phenomenon was partly due to the influences of the culture and practice of hostile questioning from the West, and that there was a desire by local, Chinese interviewers to "protect and uphold their national pride" (Sun, 2005, pp. 38).

Clayman remodeled the QAS and applied it in another collaborative study with Heritage in 2006. Both researchers wanted to compare the level of adverseness in four different given conditions (the administration life cycle, presidential popularity, the state of the economy and foreign affairs). As a result, the QAS introduced in 2002 was modified and expanded for this study. Apart from the first three dimensions which remain the same, the fourth dimension – hostility, was replaced by "adverseness", with "accountability" added into the system as the fifth dimension. Although an increased adversarial questioning was observed in second terms in the presidents' administration life cycle, there were no evidences proving that the presidents' honeymoon period was actually their first term, where interviewers would deliberately ask less aggressive questions as a token of sympathy. Secondly, there were no clear signs suggesting the amount of aggressiveness the presidents received was affected by their rating and popularity. However, unemployment and prime interest rate showed positive association with increased adversarial interviewing. Lastly, questions about domestic affairs contained more aggressiveness compared to questions about foreign affairs.

The remodeled QAS framework was later applied in other studies as well. Huls & Varwijk (2010) expanded the 5-dimension system with a sixth dimension – persistence, which describes interviewers' effort in pursuing a satisfactory answer. The comparative research aimed at studying the level of adverseness directed at politicians from two different political parties in the Netherlands, and the results show that right-wing politicians were treated with more adverseness compared to their left-wing counterparts.

Clayman and Heritage's QAS (2002) has proven to be an effective framework for studies of adversarial interviewing over the years. The present research, particularly in the segment analysing adverseness in the interviewers' questions, is also referring to this adverseness analysis framework to a certain extent.

2.5   Interviewees' Responses/Answering Strategies

Studies of media interviews cannot be considered complete if the interviewees' responses are neglected, as they demonstrate the effects of questioning strategies. In studies of questioning, how interviewees react towards being questioned aggressively reflect the adverseness in the interviewers' questions (Rendle-Short, 2007). Over the years, studies of interview responses have been lacking as they have been conducted briefly. Even though aggressive questions constraint interviewees' answers to a certain extent, there are ways interviewees could respond to resist the agendas demonstrated by their interviewers, where particular responses or answers are preferred over the ones the interviewees considered "unsatisfactory" (Schegloff, 1997; Wu, 2017). Resisting methods demonstrated by interviewees ranged from questioning the interviewer to restructuring the interviewers' questions (Clayman, 1993).

Apart from his contribution in introducing the QAS, Clayman also conducted studies in interviewees' responses and answering. In his research on the practice of

answering in media interviews, Clayman (2001) showed how interviewees oriented themselves to an observed pattern of answering the interviewers' questions. This can be observed not only from the way they tried not to be too aggressive when attempting to defend themselves against the interviewers' question agenda overtly, but also the way they resisted the question agenda covertly to limit the negative consequences of refusing to answer the questions. Apart from that, interviewees also resisted answering the questions by demonstrating moves or strategies such as answering only "parts of the question" or responding to the questions by giving a minimal yes/no reply without giving further elaborations. In his research, Greatbatch (1986) suggested that it is possible for the interviewers' question agendas to be shifted by their interviewees. In a study conducted by Piirainen-Marsh (2005), the researcher observed how interviewees responded to the questions by switching roles with their interviewers by asking questions aggressively. Harris (1991) classified and coded interview responses under three categories, which are direct and indirect answers, as well as challenging responses.

It is known that in media interviews, the practice of questioning and answering is a turn-based process. The notion of a question, reply or non-reply is certainly understood and self-evident (Sun, 2005). In a study of several timeline events featuring a set of data consisting of thirty-three televised interviews with British politicians, Bull (1994) introduced a guideline system to aid in identifying questions, replies and non-replies. He pointed out that interviews featuring politicians should not be solely divided into replies and non-replies. What should be focused on is the substantial proportion of interviewees' responses that are neither full replies nor failures in answering the interviewers' questions, but "the content in the middle of the two". Such a claim suggests that interviewees are actually allowed the freedom to respond or not to the interviewers' questions. In her study, Sun (2005) provided an example of a famous quote by an advisor of Pat Robertson during a commercial break in the show called

"Larry King Live". Robertson, a United States presidential candidate in 1988, was facing a series of adversarial questioning about his divisive and controversial 1992 Republican Convention speech. The nervous Robertson was told by one of his advisors that he could "give whatever answer", with the reason being he was the one answering. The idea further suggests that it is normal for politicians to appear "defensive" and "evasive" when being interviewed.

Harris' (1991) study further strengthened the acceptability of the perception and making it even more convincing. In his comparative study, interviewees were divided into two groups consisting of politicians and non-politicians and their responses categorized into three dimensions: direct, indirect and challenges. The results showed that non-politician respondents produced more direct answers (over 67%), compared to politician respondents, whose direct answers averaged only over 39%. Such a contrast suggested that politicians tend to be evasive in their answering and applied a higher degree of indirectness in responding to the interviewers' questions compared to citizens who were not associated with politics.

Kantara's (2012) study on adversarial questioning and responses in Greek political interviews suggests that the most straightforward way to examine journalistic adverseness is through the inspection of question design or adversarial questioning techniques, however, it could also be said that assessing the ones who play the "second turn" role sheds as much information about journalistic adverseness as well, in terms of how interviewees attempt to evade or respond to the aggressiveness by the interviewers. Applying a conversation analysis framework to study adversarial questioning and responses in face-to-face political news interviews, his research results revealed that journalists show their aggressiveness by: 1) predicting their interviewees' answers and explicitly requesting them to focus on the question instead of evading or dodging them,

2) requesting their interviewees explicitly to repeat their answers whenever the answers given were not what they expected to hear, 3) using colloquial terms, jokes and some layman's words in Greek as other-referencing sources, and 4) expressing their opposing stand by giving opinions disagreeing with the interviewees' answers. The mentioned adverseness, in turn, invited responses such as: 1) direct attacks on the interviewers' journalistic professionalism, 2) indirect personal attacks on the interviewers, 3) questioning the interviewers instead of answering. Lastly, the researcher concluded that it is possible for the interaction described above to take over the ever known interaction pattern in Greek political news interview, shaping what the researcher termed "new neutralism".

2.6   The Use of Illocutionary Acts in Interviews

Studies which focus on the use of illocutionary acts in interviews are not unheard of. A study was conducted by Macaulay (1996) to find out more about the strategic functions of indirect illocutionary acts in her research data, which consisted of twenty-three interviews on both radio and television. Her findings revealed that though information was mostly obtained directly, interviewers also employed different ways to request information indirectly from using assertions, rhetorical questions, requests for confirmation, to Socratic questions and clarifications.

Her study also revealed that interviewers employed strategic politeness strategies in their indirect requests to obtain information, knowing that direct requests are often negative-face threatening and that interviewers are exposed to risks of threatening the positive face of their interviewees. One way to do so is by asking the interviewee's willingness or ability to answer certain questions, as in "*Will you let me ask two more quick questions?*". Furthermore, not all indirect requests are negative face redressing. Apart from questioning their interviewees' ability to answer, interviewers

also provoke their interviewees' responses by revealing their wishes as in "*I want to talk about health care as that's one of the issues you've had to tackle.*".

Lastly, interviewees were also provoked into responding to their interviewers' assertions. Such questioning can be recognised as they are often set up with an assertion or a couple of assertions, the request itself and a follow-up assertion to reiterate their request for information, as in "*Would you be offended if I told you what I feel as a reader? And ah this is really awkward because the writer never judges. But I thought in some way that a human being has in some way to be a bastard to survive. That saints maybe don't make it.*"

Al-Duleimi and Hammoodi's (2015) research aimed to examine the concept of strategic maneuvering from a few aspects, which included strategies and processing stages during political interviews from a pragmatic perspective. A model was also developed for the purpose of analysing the researchers' choice of political interviews. The strategic maneuvering strategies investigated were hedges of the cooperative maxims, speech acts, politeness and conversational implicatures. The researchers selected a number of political interviews randomly between 2002 and 2009 to be analysed.

The findings show that there are three stages in strategic maneuvering: initiating, response and evaluating. Each of these stages is characterised by the use of different strategic maneuvering strategies. In the initiating stage, questioning and accusation illocutionary acts (45% and 30% respectively) form the highest percentage among other strategies. In the response stage, hedging of both quality and quantity maxims, positive and negative politeness, generalised and scalar implicatures, and the two pragma rhetorical tropes – overstatement and understatement achieved the highest percentages (81% and 59%; 93% and 84%; 59% and 61%, and 50% and 34% respectively). Lastly,

in the evaluation stage, the challenge strategy achieved the highest percentage (36.36%) compared to others.

A study was conducted by Kampf (2008) to study public non-apology speech acts used by public figures to minimise responsibility. A total of 354 apologies found in numerous Israeli public discourses between 1997 and 2004 were classified under four categories: i) Replacing the apology's performative verb, ii) Clouding the nature of the offense, iii) Questioning the offended and iv) Questioning the offender.

An example of replacing the apology's performative verb is to use expressions such as "*I regret*" or "*sorry*" instead of saying "*I apologise*". In this case, public figures tend to use apology verbs without responsibility such as "*I express my sorrow*" to avoid the responsibility for playing a certain role in a particular incident which offended the public. Another way is by realising non-performative apologies which can be performed by expressing one's willingness to apologise, promising to apologise and referring to any apologies made in the past.

Politicians also used non-apologies to confuse or cloud the nature of the offenses. The author noticed that some apologised even after an offense was denied – "*I apologise if people misunderstood me.*" Selectivity also occur in apologising when one apologises for the outcome and not for the act which causes the offense, for example when one says "*I am sorry for your misfortune*" rather than "*I apologise for my foolishness which causes your misfortune*". It is also possible to apologise for a particular speaking manner and not for what is said, which the author believed to be a reconciliation move performed by politicians without jeopardising their public image. Lastly, it is also possible to apologise for not an entire offense but only parts of it. One example to admit one feels sorry for the causes of their interview remarks, but not what was said.

The author also identified a non-apology tactic in which politicians purposely mentions the offended party/victim in a vague and ambiguous manner. The most common word used to undermine a victim's existence is "someone", which leaves a question mark regarding the victim's existence. In selecting a particular victim out of a group of similar victims, the offender aims to reduce the damages to his public image he might sustain. Lastly, politicians also blur the identity of the victim when they are aware that a particular person or any group of people is offended. However, instead of directly addressing a victim by his/her name, generic names are often used. The sentence "*It wasn't my intention to offend anyone or any group of people*" is a common example of blurring the identity of the victim.

The last category of non-apology focuses on the offender. Politicians often reject their own offenses by shifting the focus to the outcome of an occurrence. One example to deny responsibility is by saying one is sorry and at the same time blames the media for misquoting him. Another way of doing so is by omitting the agent of the offense. In doing so, one omits himself from the centre of attention. The most common example is the line "*I'm sorry if anyone was hurt by what's said in the newspapers.*"

Macaulay's (2001) study focused on comparing male and female interviewers and their use of indirect speech acts in requesting for information. The author's research data consist of twenty-three interviews conducted by four interviewers (two males, two females). A total of 1435 speech acts were examined and 935 of them consisted of direct and indirect requests for information. The results showed that male interviewers preferred to use direct requests in their questioning (40% and 41% respectively compared to indirect requests for a total of 29% and 21% respectively). The female interviewers used 5% less direct questioning compared to their male counterparts (35%

for both) but were considerable more indirect (37% and 31% respectively) than the male interviewers.

The author also categorised the indirect requests into three different categories: i) Conventional indirect requests, ii) 'Think' forms and iii) Assertions. The female interviewers employed similar number of conventional indirect requests and 'think forms' in their questioning (7%-4% and 7%-3% respectively). However, a sharp increase was identified in their use of assertions (23% and 24% respectively). The male interviewers had similar pattern in their questioning with 2% and 4% respectively in their use of conventional indirect requests. 'Think' forms requests were employed at 9% and 3% respectively. Lastly, assertions were also employed at a higher frequency by the male interviewers (16% and 17% respectively).

Having observed the preferences for assertions in both male and female interviewers, the author further broke down the use assertions into four different types: i) A-Events (events known only to speakers), ii) B-Events (events known only to hearers), A-B-Events (events shared between both speakers) and D-Events (events dubious to both speakers). A-Events and A-B-Events assertions were rarely used by both groups of interviewers (8% and 6% by both female interviewers respectively and 3% and 1% by both male interviewers respectively). The combined (male and female) percentage for A-B-Events assertions totaled up for only 3%. Male interviewers' preference for B-Events assertions were greater (52% and 54% respectively) compared to their female counterparts (31% and 26% respectively). Lastly, D-Events assertions were employed more by female interviewers (59% and 67% respectively) compared to male interviewers (45% and 44% respectively). The author concluded that there is no clear evidence suggesting that the interviewers' gender played a deciding role in determining the use of indirect requests.

2.7   Past Language Studies in Football

Language studies in the context of modern professional football are not rare. In Lewandowski's (2008) study, the researcher tried to categorise ten sub-varieties of "football language" into two groups: sociolect and register. Humpolik (2014) attempted to analyse and compare the linguistic features of television, radio and computer game commentary and Bergh (2011) attempted to study the use of war-inspired terms in football commentary.

The ten sub-varieties of "football language" studied in Lewandowski's (2008) are i) The language of football players and coaching staff, ii) The language of football rules, regulations and statutes, iii) The language of football theories, iv) The language of televised football commentary, v) The language of radio football commentary, vi) The language of press writings on football, vii) The language of football websites, viii) The language of football fans, ix) The language of football refereeing officials, and last but not least the language of football stadium announcers.

Lewandowski claimed that most of the sub-varieties are registers rather than sociolect, due to the use of language are heavily influenced by their environment and surrounding. All the written sub-varieties are classified under the category of register, which are the language of football rules, regulations and statutes, football theories, press writings on football, and football websites. The language of televised and radio football commentaries are also considered as registers, mainly because the choice of language is influenced by the happenings on the football field. The language of football stadium announces can be categorised as closed register, as the form of language is considered fixed and restricted. The language of refereeing officials is similar. The only difference in terms of language use lies in the types of competition the refereeing officials participate in, such as official matches or practise matches.

While the language of football players and coaching staff is considered as a sociolect, Lewandowski argued that it could be regarded as a register, as coaching staff and players do not actually share strong bonds with each other due to players often come from different clubs. As a result, it is difficult to consider the players and the coaching staff a community group sharing an established tradition. However, players and coaches may use football terms due to their environment and surrounding, which puts this sub-variety under the category of register. Lastly, the term sociolect can be used to describe the language of football fans, provided that these fans are grouped together and form subcultures based on the teams they support. The language use serves as identity marker with the specific language items singles out different group of fans supporting different teams.

Bergh's (2011) study looks at how football is likened to war through the use of war-inspired terms in live football commentary. The study was conducted to answer these three research questions which are: i) How far is football likened to war in current live football commentary? ii) What are the predominant aspects in terms of war-inspired terms in the commentaries? And iii) What are the causes of the use of war-inspired terms in football commentaries?

The results revealed that out of the 21101 words in the researcher's data which consisted of seven live commentaries of Euro 2008 tournament, 672 were identified as war-inspired terms. The results, in the researcher's opinion, indicated a rather extensive use of war-inspired terms in the context of live football commentaries that it supported his hypothesis that live football commentaries are conceptualised with violence and warfare.

To answer the second research question, a 4-category system was devised to categorise the 672 terms in order to find out the predominant type of war-inspired term

in this context. Action words (verbs) such as *defend*, *retreat*, *attack*, *collapse*, etc were mostly used (306 out of 672), followed by words depicting states/activities/results (nouns) such as *injury*, *disaster*, *submission*, *escape*, etc (255 out of 672). Attributive words (adjectives) such as *brave*, *brutal*, *ferocious*, *tactical*, etc came third (65 out of 672), with the agent words (nouns) such as *army*, *captain*, *enemy*, *squad*, etc came last (46 out of 672) as the least used war-inspired terms in this context. The researcher concluded that the terms managed to cover most major aspects of the warfare domain, from metaphors derived from concepts of warfare and battlefield such as *attack* (action words), *defensive* (attributive words), *captain* (agent words) and *shot* (words depicting activity/state/result) to general or vague war-related expressions such as *dangerous* (attributive words), *failure* (words depicting activity/state/result), *knock* (action words) and *winner* (agent words).

For the third research question on the causes of the use of war-inspired terms in football commentaries, the researcher claimed that the conceptual connection of the war and football domains can be accounted for the use of war-inspired terms in football commentaries. Firstly, key concepts of war and football were listed and in the researcher's opinion, the metaphor "football is war" is totally acceptable considering that wars are started by political conflicts and fought in the battlefield, while football is a kind of sports competition played in a stadium or arena. Soldiers form armies and with their aggression, handle weapons and ammunition, while football players form teams and with their skills, challenge their opponents and try to win matches by scoring using various parts of their body. Political supremacy is achieved by soldiers killing all their enemies, while trophies/titles in football are won by players scoring against their opponents. Such concept relatedness suggests it is acceptable to put football and warfare in the same bracket.

In Humpolik's (2014) study, the researcher aimed to analyse and compare the paralinguistic features, syntactic features and lexical features of three different types of football commentary, which are television commentary, radio commentary and computer game commentary. For the analysis of radio commentary, extracts of three matches (AC Milan VS Arsenal, played 15th February, 2012, Ajax Amsterdam VS Real Madrid, played 3rd October, 2012 and Manchester United VS Chelsea, played 3rd October, 2012) were used. Extracts of another three matches (Liverpool VS Tottenham, played 30th March, 2014, Arsenal VS Swansea, played 25th March, 2014 and Everton VS Liverpool, played 16th April, 2001) were used for television commentary. Lastly, transcriptions of four matches (Arsenal VS Tottenham, England VS Republic of Ireland, Liverpool VS Manchester United and Czech Republic VS Scotland) in the FIFA 2013 computer game were used for analysis.

In analysing the paralinguistic features of radio and television commentary, the main difference between these two commentaries is the level of segmentation, due to more verbalisation in radio commentary to compensate for the lack of information in the form of visual images. The researcher also identified a number of syntactic features, such as substitution, tagging, heavy modifiers, ellipsis, widely use of passives, and result expression with *to* and *for*. There were no notable differences apart from more cases of ellipsis in television commentary. More words were omitted in television commenting, as the audiences were visually informed and needed less information from the commentators. In analysing the lexical features, a higher frequency of formulaic and pre-constructed phrases was observed in radio commentary.

The computer game commentary was analysed separately and its features were considered similar to those of television commentary due to the matches and commentary were actually simulations of real-life matches and commentary. However,

a higher level of substitution was observed, particularly in demonstrative and inexact personal pronouns. Lastly, the researcher also concluded that utterances without context often appeared repeatedly, with utterances considered general and mismatching the in-game context, computer game commentary was, in the researcher's opinion, unauthentic as a whole.

2.8 Filling the Research Gap

Of all the past studies discussed above, majority of the studies featured broadcast political interviews as research data, while majority of the past language studies in football focused on commentaries. Indeed, studies of post-match interview have been limited over the years, with most studies on interview adverseness and responses focused on the context of political news interviews analyzing data consisting of interview questions and responses of politicians or election candidates. This present study explores the language use of Jose Mourinho, a recognised figure in sporting event, instead of a figure in politics, in different given match outcomes (win and defeat/draw) under the influence of adversarial questioning from the interviewers. There is a lack of similar research design in current existing studies, with the closest one conducted by File (2012). In his study focusing on the language use of those who are involved in the New Zealand professional rugby competition, the results revealed that interviewers were focused on creating a conciliatory and friendly interviewing experience, compared to interview experience in political news interviews which is considered adversarial and combative.

Another research gap this present study aims to fill is a framework-based data analysis. Apart from analyzing the interviewers' questions in a similar way to most of the research works mentioned above by applying an expanded Clayman's QAS framework, the interviewees' answers for this present study will be classified based on

Searle's classification system of illocutionary acts, unlike most of the studies discussed previously, which applied a non-framework analysis for the interviewees' responses.

2.9   Conclusion

Austin introduced the differences of constative and performative utterances at first and the concept of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary later, after the concept of constatives and performatives were criticized by Searle. Austin then proceeded to introduce a five-category illocutionary act classification system. The five categories are verdictives, exercitives, commissives, behabitives and expositives. The classification system also invited criticisms from his student, who claimed the system was flawed with Austin's confusion in differentiating illocutionary acts and illocutionary verbs. In fact, not all the verbs are illocutionary verbs. Apart from not showing enough principles in the classification, there were also signs of overlapping between members from one category to another. Searle further listed out some examples of "questionable classification" and "failure definition of acts".

The chapter ends with the researcher showing some of the research gaps neglected in some of the past language studies in the context of modern professional football, as well as studies featuring the use of illocutionary acts in interviews. The researcher also explained how those mentioned voids can be filled by this study. The lack of studies conducted within a sports post-match interview context has been the main consideration for this study to be conducted. Apart from that, the lack of framework-based analysis on the interviewees' responses in the mentioned studies is also seen as the starting point of this research. The next chapter presents the methodology and research frameworks applied in conducting this research.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1   Introduction

The present chapter aims to explain the methodology adopted in this study. Firstly, the chapter begins by discussing the research design implemented by the researcher in conducting this study in section 3.2. Section 3.3 presents the research data for analysis that are central to this study, which consist of the post-match interviews featuring Jose Mourinho and a list of the interviewers for the matches. With the introduction of the research data completed, the next section explains how the match codes function in this research to locate transcriptions of the interviews. Next, section 3.5 shows how Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts and the adverseness in the interviewers' questions are analysed. Section 3.6 discusses two analytical frameworks that are applied in this study, with section 3.7 explains how they are applied in analysing the research data. Section 3.8 features a detailed explanation of the procedures that the researcher follows in order to conduct this study. Lastly, this chapter will be concluded in section 3.9.

3.2   Research Design

The aim of the present research is to provide an insight in the use of illocutionary acts in sports media by using post-match interviews featuring Jose Mourinho as research data. In the researcher's opinion, a qualitative research design is the most suitable and appropriate set-up for this study. According to Atkinson et. al (2001), though researches with a qualitative set-up can be conducted with different approaches, they have all but one similar goal and aim, which is to contribute towards the understanding of, from a wider scope, a certain culture, to the characteristics of a particular group of people or even individuals when the scope is narrowed down. In other words, studies that are designed qualitatively often reveal the researchers'

intention to explore the behaviors, feelings, perspectives and experiences of their selected subjects. Based on the Atkinson's explanations, a qualitative research design suits this present research well, as data consist of Jose Mourinho's post-match interviews are analysed in order to develop a basic understanding of how illocutionary acts are used in sports media interviews, particularly in the context of professional football. The present research is also quantitative to a certain degree, given that results are presented numerically and the occurrence of certain phenomena in the form of noticeable statistical patterns. Possible causes and effects which contribute to the occurrences of the phenomena are then investigated and explained.

3.3   Data Collection

There are two sub-sections to the data collection of this research. Apart from discussing about the video clips of Jose Mourinho's post-match interviews, the interviewers, which form an integral part in answering the second research question about the use of adversarial questioning by the interviewers, will also be discussed.

3.3.1   Jose Mourinho's Post-match Interviews

The data which will be analysed are video clips of Jose Mourinho's post-match interviews in the Barclays Premier League season 2014/2015, a period when he was still in charge as Chelsea Football Club's first team manager. Available and downloaded from www.Youtube.com, the video clips have different length, with the shortest being two minutes and the longest being seven minutes. The table below shows a list of the post-match interviews of all matches with a defeat/draw outcome in order:

Table 3.1: List of Chelsea's Defeat/Draw Matches in Season 2014/2015

No.	Matches	Date	Results	Match Outcome
1	Manchester City – Chelsea	21/9/2014	1 – 1	Draw
2	Manchester United – Chelsea	26/10/2014	1 – 1	Draw
3	Sunderland – Chelsea	29/11/2014	0 – 0	Draw
4	Newcastle – Chelsea	6/12/2014	2 – 1	Defeat
5	Southampton – Chelsea	28/12/2014	1 – 1	Draw
6	Tottenham Hotspur – Chelsea	1/1/2015	5 – 3	Defeat
7	Chelsea – Burnley	21/2/2015	1 – 1	Draw
8	Chelsea – Southampton	15/3/2015	1 – 1	Draw
9	Arsenal – Chelsea	26/4/2015	0 – 0	Draw
10	Chelsea – Liverpool	10/5/2015	1 – 1	Draw
11	West Bromwich Albion – Chelsea	18/5/2015	3 – 0	Defeat

With the list of the post-match interviews of all defeat/draw matches presented,

the remaining twenty-five post-match interviews of all winning matches are shown

below:

Table 3.2: List of Chelsea's Win Matches in Season 2014/2015

No.	Matches	Date	Results	Match Outcome
1	Burnley – Chelsea	18/8/2014	1 – 3	Win
2	Chelsea – Leicester City	23/8/2014	2 – 0	Win
3	Everton – Chelsea	30/8/2014	3 – 6	Win
4	Chelsea – Swansea City	13/9/2014	4 – 2	Win
5	Chelsea – Aston Villa	27/9/2014	3 – 0	Win
6	Chelsea – Arsenal	5/10/2014	2 – 0	Win
7	Crystal Palace – Chelsea	18/10/2014	1 – 2	Win
8	Chelsea – QPR	1/11/2014	2 – 1	Win
9	Liverpool – Chelsea	8/11/2014	1 – 2	Win
10	Chelsea – West Brom	22/11/2014	2 – 0	Win
11	Chelsea – Tottenham Hotspur	3/12/2014	3 – 0	Win
12	Chelsea – Hull City	13/12/2014	2 – 0	Win
13	Stoke City – Chelsea	22/12/2014	0 – 2	Win
14	Chelsea – West Ham United	26/12/2014	2 – 0	Win
15	Swansea City – Chelsea	17/1/2015	0 – 5	Win
16	Aston Villa – Chelsea	7/2/2015	1 – 2	Win
17	Chelsea – Everton	11/2/2015	1 – 0	Win
18	West Ham United – Chelsea	4/3/2015	0 – 1	Win
19	Hull City – Chelsea	22/3/2015	2 – 3	Win
20	Chelsea – Stoke City	4/4/2015	2 – 1	Win
21	QPR – Chelsea	12/4/2015	0 – 1	Win
22	Chelsea – Manchester United	18/4/2015	1 – 0	Win
23	Leicester City – Chelsea	29/4/2015	1 – 3	Win
24	Chelsea – Crystal Palace	3/5/2015	1 – 0	Win
25	Chelsea – Sunderland	24/5/2015	3 – 1	Win

As the present research is considered a comparative study which aims to compare the patterns of Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts and the interviewers' adversarial interviewing under two types of match outcome (win and defeat/draw), the post-match interviews is separated into two groups (win and defeat/draw). Although a defeat or a draw may seem like two different match outcomes, both outcomes are grouped together as they are considered not a victory. As mentioned in Chapter 1, winning a match gives a team three points, while only one point is shared by both teams in a tied match and none is given to the losing team, this research is only focused on studying Jose Mourinho's illocutionary act patterns and the extent of adversarial questioning from the interviewers in two different situations, when matches were won and when matches were not won.

Although coaching staff were usually interviewed separately by more than one reporter from different sports news agency (Sky Sports, BBC and so on) at the end of the matches, the researcher has chosen only one video per match to be transcribed based on a number of considerations: a) The completeness of the video; videos must not be broken (videos end before the interviews do) and must show the whole interview, b) The resolution of the video; videos must be clear and not blurry, and lastly, c) The sound quality of the video; as the conversations between Jose Mourinho and the interviewers are to be transcribed and analysed, only the videos with the clearest conversation (complete interviews with clear image and sound quality) are chosen.

Most of the chosen post-match interviews are able to meet the criteria mentioned above, with some of the videos having some imperfections such as low video resolution and lower sound quality which do not affect the transcribing. Three videos failed to meet the "completeness" criterion. The three videos show Jose Mourinho answering before the interviewer's question was asked, which shows that the videos might have

been cropped and edited. The three videos are: 1) Chelsea 2-0 Leicester City, played 23/8/2014, 2) Chelsea 4-2 Swansea City, played 13/9/2014 and 3) Chelsea 3-1 Sunderland, played 24/5/2015.

Of all the thirty-eight matches in season 2014/2015, only thirty-six of them are included in this present research, with the other two matches not featured simply because Jose Mourinho did not turn up for the post-match interviews and had actually left the post-match interviews to his assistant. The two matches were: 1) Chelsea 2-0 Newcastle, played 10/1/2015, and 2) Chelsea 1-1 Manchester City, played 31/1/2015. As a result, post-match interviews of the two mentioned matches will not be featured in this present research for analysis.

3.3.2   The Interviewers

Different interviewers from different sports news agencies (Sky Sports, BBC and so on) were assigned to interview Jose Mourinho. Their faces were not shown to the viewers, as the scene was closing-up on the Portuguese manager. The interviewers' names were also not revealed, hence only their voices can be heard. However, for this research, the importance of the interviewers' appearances, as well as their background information; due to not yielding any importance to the conducting of this research, should not be focused more than the adverseness found in their questioning, as well as the manner the adverseness were applied in their questioning. Hence who the interviewers are and their background do not in any way affect the use of adverse questioning nor influence the responses.

Table 3.3: Post-match Interviewers of Premier League Matches (BPL Season 2014/2015)

No.	Matches	Date	Interviewer
1	Manchester City – Chelsea	21/9/2014	Interviewer 1
2	Manchester United – Chelsea	26/10/2014	Interviewer 2
3	Sunderland – Chelsea	29/11/2014	Interviewer 3
4	Newcastle United – Chelsea	6/12/2014	Interviewer 4
5	Southampton – Chelsea	28/12/2014	Interviewer 5
6	Tottenham Hotspur – Chelsea	1/1/2015	Interviewer 6
7	Chelsea – Burnley	21/2/2015	Interviewer 7
8	Chelsea – Southampton	15/3/2015	Interviewer 8
9	Arsenal – Chelsea	26/4/2015	Interviewer 9
10	Chelsea – Liverpool	10/5/2015	Interviewer 10
11	West Bromwich Albion – Chelsea	18/5/2015	Interviewer 11
12	Burnley – Chelsea	18/8/2014	Interviewer 12
13	Chelsea – Leicester City	23/8/2014	Interviewer 13
14	Everton – Chelsea	30/8/2014	Interviewer 14
15	Chelsea – Swansea City	13/9/2014	Interviewer 15
16	Chelsea – Aston Villa	27/9/2014	Interviewer 16
17	Chelsea – Arsenal	5/10/2014	Interviewer 17
18	Crystal Palace – Chelsea	18/10/2014	Interviewer 18
19	Chelsea – QPR	1/11/2014	Interviewer 19
20	Liverpool – Chelsea	8/11/2014	Interviewer 20
21	Chelsea – West Brom	22/11/2014	Interviewer 21
22	Chelsea – Tottenham Hotspur	3/12/2014	Interviewer 22
23	Chelsea – Hull City	13/12/2014	Interviewer 23
24	Stoke City – Chelsea	22/12/2014	Interviewer 24
25	Chelsea – West Ham United	26/12/2014	Interviewer 25
26	Swansea City – Chelsea	17/1/2015	Interviewer 26
27	Aston Villa – Chelsea	7/2/2015	Interviewer 27
28	Chelsea – Everton	11/2/2015	Interviewer 28
29	West Ham United – Chelsea	4/3/2015	Interviewer 29
30	Hull City – Chelsea	22/3/2015	Interviewer 30
31	Chelsea – Stoke City	4/4/2015	Interviewer 31
32	QPR – Chelsea	12/4/2015	Interviewer 32
33	Chelsea – Manchester United	18/4/2015	Interviewer 33
34	Leicester City – Chelsea	29/4/2015	Interviewer 34
35	Chelsea – Crystal Palace	3/5/2015	Interviewer 35
36	Chelsea – Sunderland	24/5/2015	Interviewer 36

Since the names of the interviewers are not revealed, the researcher has chosen to assign the interviewers a number as shown in the table above.

With the research data and the interviewers for analysis presented, the next section explains the methodology for data analysis. In other words, how Jose

Mourinho's utterances and the interviewers' questions are classified with the correct illocutionary act category and QAS category discussed in the previous chapter.

3.4   Match Codes

Match codes are designed specifically to enable easier location of the post-match interview transcriptions featured as appendices of this research. In other words, each post-match interview transcript has its own code which shows the match outcome, the two competing teams (home and away, with the team playing at home ground stated first) and the scores of the match. The three match outcomes are represented using letters W (win), L (lose) and D (draw), while numbers are used to show the scores of the match. Last but not least, the two competing teams' names are shown in their abbreviated forms. The table below presents the abbreviations of the teams competing in the Barclays Premier League in season 2014/2015:

Table 3.4: Abbreviations of Premier League Teams (BPL Season 2014/2015)

Abbreviations	Premier League Teams (BPL Season 2014/2015)
ARS	Arsenal
AST	Aston Villa
BUR	Burnley
CHE	Chelsea
CRP	Crystal Palace
EVE	Everton
HUL	Hull City
LCT	Leicester City
LIV	Liverpool
MCT	Manchester City
MUT	Manchester United
NEW	Newcastle United
QPR	Queens Park Rangers
SHT	Southampton
STK	Stoke City
SUN	Sunderland
SWA	Swansea City
TOT	Tottenham Hotspur
WBA	West Bromwich Albion
WHU	West Ham United

In short, a match code of WCHE31STK means a winning match for Chelsea against Stoke City, with the home team (team on the left) scoring three goals against the away team (team on the right) and conceding one to the visitor; while a match code of LNEW21CHE means a losing match for Chelsea, with the home team (Newcastle United) scoring twice and conceding once against Chelsea (the away team).

3.5   Procedure for Data Collection

As the researcher has decided to analyse Jose Mourinho's post-match interviews of matches played by Chelsea in the Barclays Premier League season 2014/2015, the list of matches played in that season are identified first and obtained from the official website of Chelsea Football Club (www.chelseafc.com). With the matches known, the post-match interview videos are then downloaded from www.youtube.com. The selection of the most appropriate post-match interview videos to be downloaded is based on the criteria listed in section 3.3.1.

The data collection then proceeds with transcribing the interview exchanges. Transcriptions of the post-match interviews are featured in the appendix section with other details such as match codes and match reports for better understanding of the interview context.

Interview exchanges are shown in turn-based format. Utterances regardless of their length are analysed as a whole, rather than broken up in smaller paragraphs, sentences or phrases for analysis. In other words, when analysing Jose Mourinho's responses, the particular answering turn is analysed as a whole and categorised with an illocutionary act category. For exchanges with more than one illocutionary acts identified, the researcher prioritises the type, rather than the order of illocutionary acts. In other words, there is no difference between representative + directive and directive + representative.

57

3.6   Analytical Framework

Two research frameworks have been selected to analyse the data for this research. Analysis of the interviewers' questions is based on Huls and Varwijk (2010) expanded Question Analysis System (QAS), while classification of Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts is based on Searle's classification of illocutionary acts (1976). The next two subsections consist of the two analytical frameworks used in this study.

3.6.1   Searle's Taxonomy of Illocutionary Act Classification (1976)

Searle pointed out three dimensions that are vital to his classification system, which are illocutionary point, direction of fit and psychological state. He realised that the biggest weakness in Austin's classification is the lack of a clear principle on which the classification is based on. A detailed explanation of these three dimensions is given below:

3.6.1.1 Illocutionary point

Siebel (2002) pointed out the importance of illocutionary point, to the extent he thought that illocutionary point makes an act "a valid illocutionary act"; an act does not fit as an illocutionary act without an illocutionary point. It later became one of the principles Searle relied on in classification of illocutionary acts in his taxonomy. According to Searle, illocutionary point refers to an act's purpose of function. For example, if a group of illocutionary acts consists of "promise", "order", "challenge", "describe", "explain", and "vow" were to be classified under a certain illocutionary act category, "describe" and "explain" would be under the same category, as both of these acts' illocutionary points reflect the speaker's beliefs in a certain case, which can be assessed with "true" or "false". "Order" and "challenge" are to be grouped together as both of these acts, in varying degrees, reflect the speaker's desire that the hearer to carry

out certain tasks. Lastly, acts of "promise" and "vow" belong under the same category as both acts commit the speaker to a certain course of action.

3.6.1.2 Direction of fit

According to Searle, illocutionary acts also differ from each other in terms of their direction of fit, i.e. some acts function in a way where the speaker uses his/her words to match the reality of the world, while some rely on using the reality to match the speaker's words. Humberstone (1992), in his writing – "Direction of Fit", highlighted an example given by Anscombe (1957). Anscombe used an analogy of a shopper with a shopping list followed by a detective. In the shopper's case, he was picking up items based on the shopping list, while the detective was observing and listing down the items the shopper purchased. The act of picking up items, according to Anscombe, is equivalent to creating a world that matches with the words. In the case of the detective, writing down the things in the shopper's bag is an example of matching the world using words. The concept is applied in Searle's classification. For example, an act of promise is an act with a world-to-word direction of fit, simply because the speaker has to carry out the tasks he uttered. On the other hand, the direction of fit in an act of describing is considered word-to-world, simply because the speaker's descriptions come from the speaker's opinion of the world.

3.6.1.3 Psychological state

Searle stated that it is possible to group illocutionary acts by the speaker's psychological state, too. Again, using the same group of illocutionary acts mentioned before as examples, e.g. "promise", "order", "challenge", "describe", "explain", and "vow", firstly, "vow" and "promise" fall under the same category of psychological state which is the speaker's intention to carry out certain tasks. "Order" and "challenge" would be grouped together as both acts reflect the speaker's wish for the hearer to carry out certain tasks. Lastly, "describe" and "explain" express the speaker's belief in a

particular event. In conclusion, a speaker expresses his/her attitude to a certain extent when performing an illocutionary act, which shows the psychological state of the speaker.

With the three dimensions Searle claimed to be the principles which he built his taxonomy on, the five categories of illocutionary act which he remodeled after Austin's will be looked at.

a)   Representative

According to Searle, the purpose of members in the representative category is to "commit the speaker" to the truth of the spoken proposition, which Altikriti (2011) claimed to be the values of "true" or "false". In this class, Searle also pointed out that the truthfulness of all its members must be "assessable" to be considered as a representation/assertion.

The illocutionary point of all representative members commits the speaker to something being the case in varying degrees. With a word-to-world direction of fit, speakers attempt to fit their words to match the reality. The "belief that (p)" psychological state symbolises the speaker's attitude in using a representation, which is expressing his belief that p (propositional content hereinafter). Examples of representative are "explain", "describe", "state" and "deny".

b)   Directive

Directives are used as moves to get the hearer to do something and require the speaker's reaction either verbally or physically (Rácová & Horecký, 2006). In his taxonomy, Searle pointed out that rather than orders and commands, it is more appropriate to consider directives as "attempts" by the speaker to influence the hearer into doing something. The strength of the illocutionary force determines the extent of

the speaker's attempt. Weaker directive force produces softer attempts, such as suggesting or asking; while stronger directive force gives away fiercer attempts, such as ordering, forcing, or commanding.

All directive acts' illocutionary points reflect attempts (at varying degrees) to influence the hearer to perform tasks the speaker wishes to be carried out. The direction of fit for all directive acts is world-to-word. In this case, speakers create a world of the hearer performing a certain task using their words. On the speaker's psychological state, directives reflect the speaker's wish/want/desire for the hearer to carry out a particular task. Examples of directive are "command", "suggest", "ask" and "order".

c)   Commissive

According to Searle, commissives are acts which the speaker used to commit himself to certain actions in the future. Instead of reflecting the speaker's wish that the hearer performs a particular action, it is the speaker who will be carrying out the action they have committed themselves to. Again, illocutionary force at different level of strength shows different attempts of commitment by the speaker. Stronger illocutionary force produces greater commitment such as "swearing" and "pledging"; while illocutionary force at a weaker level shows commissive acts like "offering" and "accepting". According to Chow et al. (2012), offering is considered a commissive act as well when a speaker offers to do something or accepting the invitation to do something.

Smith (1991) claimed that all illocutionary acts which speakers used to commit themselves to certain actions in the future are commissive in nature and are marked with the commissive illocutionary point. Similar to directives, all commissive illocutionary acts have the world-to-word direction of fit, as speakers verbally create a world to fit their words. The psychological state reflects the speaker's intention in commiting

himself in carrying out a particular action in the future. Examples of commissive illocutionary acts are "promise", "swear", "pledge" and "vow".

d)   Expressive

The point of using expressives is to express the speaker's psychological state over a particular matter. The direction of fit of all the expressive acts is neither word-to-world nor world-to-word. According to Searle, when a speaker expresses his psychological act, it is not an act where he attempts to match the world with his words, nor is he doing something so that the reality matches his words. Virbel (2015) explained that the truth of the act is presupposed, which means when a speaker makes a mistake, an apology is presupposed; or when a speaker receives a gift, a thanking act is assumed to follow.

The expressive illocutionary point refers to all illocutionary acts which speakers use to express their psychological states. There is no direction of fit in performing expressives, as the speaker is neither fitting his words to reality, nor changing the reality to fit his words. The speaker's psychological state (guilt, gratitude, welcome, etc) must be related to a property of the speaker/hearer. An example of this can be that it is possible for one to express guilt for his own mistake, or to express his gratitude for the speaker's generosity. However, it is not possible for someone to congratulate someone on the invention of the unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV), unless the person being congratulated is the inventor himself. Acts with an expressive illocutionary point include thanking, welcoming, apologizing and condoling.

e)   Declarations

Searle did not ignore the possibility of acts which, upon successful performance, will lead to changing the order of the world. Examples of utterance such as "*You're*

hired", "*I disown you*", and "*I declare this a war between these two nations*". Declarations have both word-to-world and world-to-word direction of fit due to its declarative characteristic. According to Vandervaken (1990), declarations' double direction of fit (word-to-world and world-to-word) is due to the manner declarations function, where the speaker attempts to create a reality which matches the propositional content by claiming that the propositional content matches with the reality.

The declarative illocutionary point stands for all acts performed declaratively; with a double direction of fit. There is no sincerity condition involved when declaring the propositional content, hence the status for the sincerity condition of a declaration is "null". Searle added that there are often overlaps between declarations and representations, particularly in situations where not only facts are said, but also the said propositional content, once uttered by the appropriate persons with certain authority, changes the reality as well. An example is when a football match referee saying "*you're out*" to a player with a red card in his hand; not only the player has committed fouls, but he will also be sent off and not playing the remaining minutes.

Such utterances feature a declarative as well as a representative illocutionary point, with two types of direction of fit; the first is a representative, word-to-world direction of fit, with the second being a declarative, double direction of fit (word-to-world and world-to-word). Since the propositional content is a factual statement, the sincerity condition reflects the speaker's belief, where the said propositional content is the truth the speaker believes in.

The reason for selecting Searle's illocutionary act classification system as the analytical framework to analyse Jose Mourinho's utterances is very much due to the suitability of Searle's classification system to analyse Jose Mourinho's intention, direction of fit and his psychological state behind his controversial responses, as Bach

(1994) views illocutionary acts as speaker's intention to communicate something to the hearer. This justifies the researcher's selection of Searle's classification system to examine the reasons behind Jose Mourinho's controversies.

With the presentation of Searle's illocutionary act classification system, the next section looks at another analytical framework which will be used to analyse the interviewer's questions.

3.6.2 Question Analysis System

The question analysis system (QAS) was first introduced by Clayman and Heritage (2002) to classify adversarial techniques used by interviewers during interview sessions. Both researchers felt the need to conduct extensive studies on interview adverseness by "building on existing research trend" consists of studies on conventional interview practices and conversation analysis, due to the difficulty to identify and classify adversarial moves in press conferences and broadcast news interviews. Such moves were once described by Kernell (1986) as "elusive" and "difficult to quantify".

The four adverseness dimensions in Clayman and Heritage (2002) QAS consist of (1) Initiative, (2) Directness, (3) Assertiveness, and (4) Hostility.

3.6.2.1 Initiative

According to Clayman et. al (2013), interviewers take initiative when they are not taking their usual, known passive stance like they are expected during interviews. The reason of such interviewing is to set constraints on the interviewees' answers, and by limiting their interviewees' answering options, interviewers could make sure their interviewees do not answer more than what they are questioned. Clayman listed three indicators which show when an interviewer exercises initiative.

3.6.2.1.1 Two or More Questions in a Single Turn

What is known to all is the one-question-per-turn practice that has been the norm of journalist conduct. Alternatively, interviewers do elaborate on their questioning turn by asking more than one question in a single questioning turn. An example is given below to show such questioning:

Example 1:

Match Code:	DCHE11LIV
Interviewer 10:	*Do you allow yourself any time to relax or you already started planning when you brought in young Ruben Loftus-Cheek for his debut. Are you planning straight away for title defence?*
Jose Mourinho:	*Yeah, I want to go for holidays and be in holidays, so when I go to holidays, I go with the maximum of homework done so now I have to work and I still have to compete. I know that against West Bromwich was a game where two teams were free of any pressure because we both reached the objective. (Crystal) Palace's game against Sunderland I don't know but the respect for football has to be always and we're going to try to get results.*

In the example above, the interviewer took an initiative and broke the usual one-question-per-turn practice by asking three questions in one turn. With the first and third questions not showing any assertiveness by the interviewer, his second question showed that he was making a guess of Jose Mourinho's next move over the substitution of Ruben Loftus-Cheek.

3.6.2.1.2 The Use of Statement Prefaces

It is often observed in broadcast interviews that factual statements are sometimes said before a question is asked. Regarding such questioning, it is claimed by Clayman & Heritage (2002) that it reflects the interviewers' intention to set constraints on their

interviewees' answers by focusing them on the context in the statements. An example is given below to show such questioning:

Example 2:

Match Code:	WCHE42SWA
Interviewer 12:	*A hat trick for Diego Costa, what is it that makes him a special player, if he is one?*
Jose Mourinho:	*He's a special player, one of the best strikers that you have in this moment in football and the team is an attacking team, a team that attacks a lot, a team that projects a lot of people in attacking spaces and creating spaces for strikers. If you look at the second goal, it's a brilliant, collective action and Febregas appeared in a position where many would try to shoot. Fabregas thinks football and has a fantastic assist Diego put the ball in the net. He's a good player but he's in a team that's a good team.*

In the interviewer's questioning turn, the exact question "*what is it that makes him a special player, if he is one?*" was asked after he mentioned Diego Costa's hat trick (scoring three goals in one match). The interviewer's intention to prompt Jose Mourinho into agreeing to his opinion that Costa is a special player was showing here, as it is extremely difficult to score a hat trick in a match

3.6.2.1.3   Follow-up Questions

According to Clayman and Heritage (2002), the way initiative is exercised by asking follow-up questions can be identified when a more substantial question is asked after the interviewee answers the question prior to that follow-up question. An example of follow-up question is given below:

Example 3:

Match Code:	DSHT11CHE
Interviewer 5:	*So you think the other managers talking about this and putting pressure on the referee?*
Jose Mourinho:	*On the referee, of course. They're human, they're human and their tendency is to react that way.*
Interviewer 5:	*Will you do anything about it? Talk to anybody about it?*

Two questions were asked in the interviewer's second questioning turn, the questions "*Will you do anything about it? Talk to anybody about it?*" was a follow-up on his question about the managers' pressuring the referees to prevent Chelsea from winning their matches. The follow-up question was more substantial as it is more elaborate and focused on finding out Jose Mourinho's approaches to solve such problem.

3.6.2.2 Directness

The concept of directness in media interviews refers to the straightforwardness (asking blunt, direct questions) or indirectness applied by interviewers when questioning their interviewees. As Alfahad (2014) mentioned in his study, the application of directness refers to the degree or extent of indirectness applied in the interviewers' questions, which reflects the level of cautiousness in the interviewers in not offending their interviewees. Indicators of indirectness questioning strategies are (i) Other-referencing question frames and (ii) Self-referencing question frames.

3.6.2.2.1 Other-referencing Question Frames

The use of other-referencing question frames consists of the interviewers' references to their interviewees' willingness or ability to answer their questions with the use of other-referencing markers such as "*can you comment on…?*", "*will you share with us about…?*" or "*would you tell us about…?*" An example of the use of other-referencing question frame is given below:

Example 4:

Match Code:	LNEW21CHE
Interviewer 4:	*Would you agree that your team was not at their best today?*
Jose Mourinho:	*No, we created lots of chances in the first-half. In the second-half, the top of the unlucky was that we hit the post, and the next situation was that they (the opponent) go and they scored a goal as a consequence of a rebound. They were very lucky, we were very unlucky. That's football, congratulations to them, and no problem with my players.*

In the interviewer's questioning turn above, he was attempting to formulate his question in an indirect way to preserve the face of Jose Mourinho by asking for his willingness to answer his question with the use of an other-referencing marker "*would you…?*". The assertion that Chelsea "*was not at their best today*", however, was his own opinion about Chelsea's performance in that match.

3.6.2.2.2 Self-referencing Question Frames

Rather than referring to their interviewees' willingness or ability to answer their questions, it is the interviewers' intentions that are reflected in the use of self-referencing question frames. Self-referencing markers include "I wonder", "I was wondering" or "I think". An example of the use of self-referencing question frame is given below:

Example 5:

Match Code:	WBUR13CHE
Interviewer 12:	*I imagine that's a difficult decision to make, you said before the game that you make decision for the club, should first team duties present themselves (to Petr Cech), would you allow him to go?*
Jose Mourinho:	*I hope he doesn't want to go, and I hope he has no offers to go, and I hope if he has offers to go, he refuses to go because the best thing that can happen to a manager and to a club is to have the best players, so if I have, in my squad two of the three best goalkeepers in the world, I would be delighted to have both.*

A self-referencing marker "*I imagine*" was used in the interviewer's questioning turn to mitigate the forcefulness of the question he is about to ask, reducing the risk of offending Jose Mourinho with his opinion about the decision to play a younger Thibaut Courtois ahead of the more experienced Petr Cech. With the marker uttered, the interviewer then proceeded to remind Jose Mourinho of his role at the club and asked a question about the transfer rumours surrounding Cech.

3.6.2.3 Assertiveness

The third dimension of interview adverseness is the assertiveness found in interviewing. According to Sun (2005), assertiveness in broadcast interviews refers to suggesting, implying or pushing for a particular answer/response in the interviewers' favour. Indicators of such questioning are i) Questions with "tilted" prefaces and ii) Suggestive questions.

3.6.2.3.1 Questions with "Tilted" Prefaces

Since the purpose of assertive questions is to invite yes/no answers (Clayman et. al, 2006), one of the two methods to prompt interviewees to respond in such way is through the use of "tilted" prefaces, mostly in the form of statements with traces of the interviewers' opinions, before asking the main questions. An example of the use of "tilted" introduction in a question is given below:

Example 6:

Match Code:	DCHE11LIV
Interviewer 10:	*Two great lions of the English game got the goals, and I like the moments Steven Gerrard went off, you applauded the away supporters as the way they applauded him as well. Wasn't that a bit of a special moment?*
Jose Mourinho:	*I think (so). I was so happy with that because the negative song Chelsea fans sang to him, I think it's (disrespectful), it's just (disrespectful) for an old, dear enemy that fought so much against us in every competition, i.e Champions League, Carling Cup, Capital Cup, Premiere League and F.A Cup. That was fantastic and after that, the standing applause, I think it was amazing because I think to get it at Anfield, he gets that weak in, weak out, year after year but away from home shows a lot so I'm happy for him and I'm happy for my people at Stamford Bridge.*

In the interviewer's questioning turn above, the preface "*Two great lions of the English game got the goals, and I like the moments Steven Gerrard went off*" was considered "tilted", as the interviewer's intention was to get Jose Mourinho to agree with his opinion that Steven Gerrard is a "special" as well as a respected player for his contribution to Liverpool.

3.6.2.3.2   Suggestive Questions

Apart from the use of "tilted" prefaces, another method to prompt interviewees into responding with a yes/no answer is through asking questions in a suggestive manner. An example of such questions can be identified with the use of negative interrogative sentences (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). An example of the use of "tilted" introduction in a question is given below:

Example 7:

Match Code:	DCHE11LIV
Interviewer 10:	*You had a great start, didn't you?*
Jose Mourinho:	*We started really well, and I think in the first half we did really well. I think their goal came from outside the context of the game. We made a mistake, it was a cheap, freaky (goal) that we gave away and after that, we were in a bad position in the box. As for the goal that put us 1-1, that was not (the goal) for 2-0, it was for 1-1.*

The tag question *"didn't you?"* in the interviewer's questioning turn showed certainty from the interviewer that Chelsea had "*a great start*" because they scored first. With the use of a negative interrogative in his question, the interviewer also expects a positive response from Jose Mourinho.

3.6.2.4 Hostility

According to Clayman & Heritage (2002), rather than identifying dimensions of adverseness for classification like the previous three QAS categories, identifying hostility in interview questioning requires more interpretation and judgment. There are multiple ways hostility can be found in interviewers' questions, from questions asking their interviewees to account or give explanations to their decisions or actions, to using hostile introductions prefacing the questions. It is also possible for simple, one-sentence

questions designed to be hostile as a whole. Such question design is what which Clayman termed as "global hostility" (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). An example of such question is given below:

Example 8:

Match Code:	LTOT53CHE
Interviewer 6:	*How do you feel your team performed defensively today?*
Jose Mourinho:	*You know, I think we made some defensive mistakes, some individual defensive mistakes. It was not easy for my defenders to cope with a good Chadly, and especially a good Kane. But it was also very difficult for Tottenham defenders to cope with an Amazing Hazard, and a good Diego Costa. And you can speak about the results, you can focus on the results, you can focus on important moments of the game, and I prefer to just focus on the results, because if I focus on the crucial moments of the game, you know what I have to say, because you have exactly the same opinion as I have and you know that was a crucial minute of the game where the game could go for a 2-0 and game over.*

To concede five goals in the match against Tottenham showed Chelsea's weak defending. The interviewer's question can be considered as a move that challenges Jose Mourinho's coaching ability as he was the one responsible for Chelsea's defensive qualities.

Besides Clayman and Heritage's (2002) framework, the researcher also looked at Huls and Varwijk's (2010) expansion on the QAS in their study. According to both researchers in their study of political bias portrayed by Dutch media, what Clayman and Heritage's (2002) QAS focused on was the context of press conference, where the interviewer has full control over the floor when each interviewer is often only allocated one or two questions at most. In the context of broadcast interviews, it is possible that in broadcast interviews that interviewees are "pursued" by coherent questions surrounding

the same topic over more than one questioning turn. Having taken into consideration that such expansion might benefit the data analysis of this research, as some of the interview questions might fit into the persistence dimension, the researcher has decided to expand the 4-dimension QAS with a fifth dimension which the persistence dimension introduced by Huls and Varwijk (2010).

3.6.2.5 Persistence

Huls and Varwijk's (2010) expanded on Clayman's QAS with a fifth dimension after realizing the system could not fit to classify all types of adversarial questioning. Both researchers' suggested that persistence lies in the interviewers' persistent questioning on the same issue despite the interviewer's evasive answers. The most common persistent questioning is when interviewers reject their interviewees' answers and demanded them to respond again on the same issue. An example of such questioning is given below:

Example 9:

Match Code:	DCHE11SHT
Interviewer 8:	*About the penalty.*
Jose Mourinho:	*About the penalty. My opinions are not important.*
Interviewer 8:	*Can you give us anyway?*
Jose Mourinho:	*No, my opinion was not important. The referee's decision, the pundits' and specialists' are, my opinions are not important.*

Having been told by Jose Mourinho that his opinions do not matter, the interviewer persisted with his intention to obtain Jose Mourinho's views about the penalty decision "*Can you give us anyway*?". The word "*anyway*" showed the interviewer's psychological state that he was not concerned about Jose Mourinho's refusal to answer his question, but the answer he deemed satisfactory.

The fifth dimension, persistence, marks the end of the expanded 5-dimension QAS. First of all, the selection of Clayman and Heritage's (2002) QAS lies in the recognition which the system has received since its introduction. Most of the studies looking at broadcast interviews' adversarial questioning over the years (Sun, 2005; Huls and Varwijk, 2010; Alfahad, 2014, etc.) have adopted the system as frameworks. This shows the potential of Clayman and Heritage's (2002) QAS as a research framework for studies in adversarial questioning. Finally, having considered that interviewers might show aggressiveness when pursuing for certain responses from Jose Mourinho, the researcher has also decided to expand on Clayman and Heritage's (2002) 4-dimension QAS with a fifth dimension − persistence as demonstrated by Huls and Varwijk (2010) in their study.

3.7 Data Analysis

As this research looks at Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts and the extent of adverseness in the interviewers' questioning, this section will be divided into three sub-sections discussing the analysis framework, as well as the methodology for analysing these two types of analysis.

3.7.1 Transcription

For analysis of the transcribed post-match interview videos of Jose Mourinho, which are considered recordings of naturally occurring talk in the form of interviews, the researcher has adopted the orthographic transcription approach. Though suggestions that the researcher should study not only textual meanings but also the nonverbal behaviours of Jose Mourinho (hand gestures, facial expressions, pauses, pitch and intonations, as well as repeated words) in his post-match interviews might arise; the researcher, for this research only looks at the post-match interviews from a verbal perspective and focuses on analysing the spoken language of Jose Mourinho and the

interviewers. As analysis of Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts and the interviewers' use of adversarial questioning lies in identifying the Portuguese manager's illocutionary point, direction of fit and psychological state in his answers, as well as the adverseness indicators in the interviewers' questions in their verbal forms, studying the nonverbal elements in these recordings of post-match interview is not necessary.

3.7.2 Jose Mourinho's Use of Illocutionary Acts

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Searle (1976) pointed out the weaknesses in Austin's classification system and identified the three dimensions that are vital to his classification system, which are illocutionary point, direction of fit and psychological state. Each illocutionary act category has its own set of the three dimensions. By combining and matching the three dimensions together according to Searle's classification system, the answer of the most suitable illocutionary act category to represent each of Jose Mourinho's utterance in the particular turn will then be obtained. Examples are given below to show how classification takes place:

Example 10:

Match Code:	DMCT11CHE
Interviewer 1:	*Overall, happy with your team today?*
Jose Mourinho:	*Yes, happy with the match today. Obviously we made a mistake in that goal (we conceded) but when you play against a top team, you focus in every aspect of the game and there'll be always a moment where you make a mistake and sometimes you're not punished. Tonight, we're punished (for our mistake).*

In Jose Mourinho's answering turn above, apart from his "*yes*" reply which highlighted his opinion on the team performance is worthy of a compliment, his view of making mistakes against big clubs could be risky as a mistake may lead to conceding a goal, just like what he recalled of what happened to Chelsea, could also be agreed/disagreed, giving this exchange a representative illocutionary point.

In terms of the direction of fit of his utterance, since Jose Mourinho was merely describing his thoughts on the players' performance and the risks of making mistakes when playing against big teams, the direction of fit is word-to-world.

Lastly, a hint of expressing his own belief on making mistakes when playing against big clubs was shown when he said "*when you play against a top team…*" The modal verb "*will*" in the line "*there will always be…*" showed a sense of an assertion of certainty from him, which reflected his belief that the risks of making defensive mistakes against top teams.

By combining the illocutionary point, direction of fit and psychological condition, the combination (a representative illocutionary point, a word-to-world direction of fit and "belief that *p*" psychological state) indicates that this utterance will be classified under the representative category.

It is also possible for Jose Mourinho to perform more than one illocutionary acts in one speaking turn. Such performance is shown in an example below:

Example 11:

Match Code:	DCHE11BUR
Interviewer 7:	*Did everything hinge on the sending off that changed everything today?*
Jose Mourinho:	*No. I think there were four moments of the game where you can write a story of the game; minute thirty, minute thirty-three, minute forty-three and minute sixty-nine. I'll repeat for you, I'll make it easier for you: minute thirty, thirty-three, forty-three and sixty-nine. The game had four moments and don't ask me more questions because I don't answer.*

In Jose Mourinho's exchange above, the expressions of "*No*" and "*I think*" showed a representative illocutionary point, as both expressions reflected Jose Mourinho's belief that the red-card decision wasn't the only reason Chelsea failed to win the game. The four moments – "*minute thirty, minute thirty-three, minute forty-three and minute sixty-nine*" were repeated intentionally with a hope that these controversial moments would be reported extensively by the interviewer. Lastly, he also showed his directive intention of making the interviewer to not ask him similar questions anymore.

In terms of the direction of fit of his utterance, Jose Mourinho's description of the moments in the match was an example of fitting words to events which have been realized. Such example has a word-to-world direction of fit. On the other hand, his intention to create a world where the four controversial moments would be covered more, as well as a reality where the interviewer stops asking him anymore questions by declaring his refusal to answer those questions were examples of world-to-word direction of fit.

Lastly, the listed controversial moments in his utterance above described Jose Mourinho's belief that the sending-off was not the only reason that cost Chelsea a victory. While the repeating of those four moments and telling the interviewer to not ask him similar questions expressed his intention to get the hearer to carry out certain tasks.

By combining the illocutionary points, direction of fits and psychological conditions, the combination will not only show a representative category, but also a directive category, indicating that Jose Mourinho's performance of illocutionary acts in this utterance will be classified as not only representative but also directive.

With the methodology of analyzing Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts explained, the next section presents the QAS classification of the interviewers' questions.

3.7.3 Interviewers' Adversarial Questioning

The interviewers' questions are classified with the corresponding adverseness by identifying the indicators Clayman & Heritage's (2002) have listed under each adverseness dimension in the QAS classification system. An example below shows the classification of an interviewer's question:

Example 12:

Match Code:	DSUN00CHE
Interviewer 3:	*It's a compliment isn't it from the way Chelsea has been playing this season?*
Jose Mourinho:	*I don't think it's a compliment, I think it's a strategy. They did that way and at the end of the game they were trying to get (a goal) from us on counter attack to see if they're double lucky. But I think in the end for the way they competed and fought for the point, they deserve the point.*

In the interviewer's questioning turn above, "*The way Chelsea has been playing this season*" referred to the performance that had got Chelsea to the top of the league since the beginning of the season. The use of a tag – "*isn't it*" was meant to invite only a yes/no response from Jose Mourinho,. In Clayman & Heritage's (2002) QAS, such questioning showed the interviewer's use of a suggestive question, which refers to an indicator listed under the assertiveness dimension. In conclusion, the adverseness in the above interviewer's question will be classified as assertiveness.

It is also possible for interviewers to apply more than one dimension of adverseness in one questioning turn. Such application is shown in an example below:

Example 13:

Match Code:	LNEW21CHE
Interviewer 4:	*Would you agree that your team was not at their best today?*
Jose Mourinho:	*No, we created lots of chances in the first-half. In the second-half, the top of the unlucky was that we hit the post, and the next situation was that they (the opponent) go and they scored a goal as a consequence of a rebound. They were very lucky, we were very unlucky. That's football, congratulations to them, and no problem with my players.*

The interviewer was attempting to formulate his question in an indirect way to preserve the face of Jose Mourinho by asking for his willingness to answer his question with the use of an other-referencing question frame "*would you*". The assertion that Chelsea "*was not at their best today*", however, cames from his own implication or opinion from what he thought about Chelsea's performance in that match. With such questioning, the interviewer's adverseness in his questioning above will be classified as "directness" and "assertiveness".

With both analysis methodology presented and explained, the next section shows the procedures of conducting the research.

3.8   Procedures of Data Analysis

Firstly, to reach the objective of understanding Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in his post-match interviews by answering the first research question "What are the illocutionary acts frequently used by Jose Mourinho after matches?", a data analysis of all Jose Mourinho's thirty-six post-match interviews during the Premier League season 2014/2015 will be performed using the methodology discussed in the previous section. For the purpose of comparison, the post-match interviews will be divided according to their match outcome (winning and defeat/draw). For the analysis of Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in his post-match interview utterances, the frequency which the illocutionary act categories appear is recorded and converted into percentages (%). An example of analysis result of Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts used in the matches ended with the winning outcome is presented using a table as shown below:

Table 3.5: Jose Mourinho's Post-match Illocutionary Acts (Example)

Illocutionary Act Category	Frequency of Use (n)	Percentage (%) = n/b x 100%
Representative	2	1.6
Directive	2	1.6
Declarations	1	0.8
Representative + Directive	119	96.0
Total (b)	124	100%

Similarly, with Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in his post-match interviews after matches with the winning outcome presented, another table with a

similar set-up displaying the frequency and percentages of illocutionary acts used in his post-match interviews after matches with the defeat/draw outcome will be presented. A comparison of the former Chelsea manager's illocutionary act performance after matches is either won or lost/drawn is then taking place and a discussion section will follow to discuss about the results of comparison in the form of three observed phenomena observed in the comparison stage. In this discussion section, what are discussed are most probably the causes of the observed phenomena in Jose Mourinho's pattern of using illocutionary acts.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, interviewees' responses reflect the adverseness in the interviewers' questions, which explains the reason why the subject of interviewers' adversarial questioning should not be neglected. With the pattern of Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts usage discussed. The research continues with the analysis of the interviewers' adversarial questioning to answer the second research question - *How does the interviewers' questioning influence Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts*?z

First of all, to analyse the influence of adversarial interviewing on Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts, interviewers' questions that were asked in the post-match interviews need to be presented. A series of table below are used to present the findings pertaining to influences of interviewers' questions on Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts.

Table 3.6: Interviewers' Post-match Questions (Example)

Interviewer's Question Category	Match Outcome	
	Win (%)	Defeat/Draw (%)
Assertiveness	55.6	36.6
Initiative	16.1	12.6
Directness	-	1.4
Initiative + Assertiveness	16.9	21.1

The table above shows an example of the frequency of each type of adversarial questioning applied by the interviewers in their questions in matches which Chelsea won and lost/draw. Examples of utterance in matches with both outcomes are then shown. The research then continues with a discussion section aimed at discussing three noticeable phenomena shown in Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts when answering to different interviewer questions. A table shown below is therefore used to achieve that aim:

Table 3.7: Jose Mourinho's Illocutionary Act by Interviewers' Questions (Example)

Interviewer's Question Category (QAS)	Illocutionary Act Category	Match Outcome	
		Win (%)	Defeat/Draw (%)
Assertiveness	Representative	54.0	26.7
	Directive	-	4.2
	Commissive	0.8	-
	Representative + Commissive	0.8	2.8
	Representative + Directive	-	2.8
Initiative	Representative	15.3	7.0
	Directive	-	-
	Commissive	-	1.4
	Representative + Commissive	0.8	1.4
	Representative + Directive	-	2.8

The data presented in the table above represent examples of the frequency of Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts (categorised) when answering to the interviewers' questions in all matches divided into two match outcomes: win and defeat/draw. Based on the data presented in the table, the researcher will then observe and take note of three noticeable phenomena and discuss them to explain the occurrences of the phenomena.

3.9   Conclusion

The third chapter of this research explained how data analysis is conducted qualitatively and quantitatively. Apart from Jose Mourinho's post-match interviews that will be analysed, the importance of the interviewers should not be neglected. However, it is not their appearances or background information, but their adversarial questioning that should be focused on. The two data analysis sub-sections explain how the three dimensions of Searle's classification (illocutionary point, direction of fit and

psychological condition) are used to classify Jose Mourinho's utterances, and how Clayman and Heritage's adversarial indicators are used to identify the interviewers' adverseness in their questioning. Analysis of Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts will take place first, followed by analysis to explain the influences of adversarial questioning on Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts.

With the conclusion of this chapter, the next chapter shows the general results of the data analysis as well as discussion results of the phenomena's occurrences as mentioned earlier.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1   Introduction

Firstly, to reach the objective of examining the pattern of Jose Mourinho's illocutionary act usage in his interviews, the illocutionary acts of Jose Mourinho in his Premier League post-match interviews (season 2014/2015) were identified and analysed. Section 4.2 presents and discusses the findings of Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts after matches. Section 4.3 then follows to present the findings which consist of the interviewers' adversarial questioning categories used in Jose Mourinho's post-match interviews. With the adversarial questioning shown, section 4.4 aims to discuss influences of adversarial questioning on Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts. Lastly, this chapter will be concluded in section 4.5.

4.2   Jose Mourinho's Illocutionary Acts after Matches

The next two sub-sections are featured to answer the first research question - "What are the illocutionary acts used by Jose Mourinho after matches?". A discussion of observed phenomena will follow after both sub-sections.

4.2.1   Jose Mourinho's Illocutionary Acts after Wins

The following table displays the analysis result of Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts used in the matches with win outcome:

Table 4.1: Jose Mourinho's Illocutionary Act's after Wins

Illocutionary Act Category	Frequency of Use (n)	Percentage (%) = n/b x 100%
Representative	119	96.0
Expressive	2	1.6
Commissive	1	0.8
Declaration	0	0
Representative + Commissive	2	1.6
Total (b)	124	100%

96% of Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts are representative in all the twenty-five matches Chelsea won, as post-match interviews serve as platform for managers to express their views, thoughts or opinions about the match played just moments ago. Thus it is understandable when representative illocutionary acts have the highest percentage in terms of usage frequency compared to the others. Examples of representative illocutionary act are given below:

Example 1

Match Code:	WCHE42SWA
Interviewer 11:	*How much satisfaction do you get personally from the summer transfer window that you had given the Costa's goal and Remy came one and scored in his debut, and Fabregas with another couple of assist?*
Jose Mourinho:	*Everybody did well, we did well first of all in deciding the profile of players we need. After that, identify the faces and finally, buy the faces. So I think everybody did well in the club and we're happy with what we did.*

This exchange contains a representative illocutionary point in. Jose Mourinho's thought that everyone at the club did a good job by bringing in the right players is assessable by the club personnel who are responsible for new players signing. Since he is merely fitting his words in a reality of how everyone played their respective part for getting a player transfer done, the direction of fit is word-to-world. Again, his thought is shown again when he credits the club's collective effort with the use of the pronoun "*we*" when he replies "*Everybody did well, we did well first of all in deciding the profile of players we need*". The phrase "*did well*" has been repeated several times in this exchange, marking his belief on the efficiency of the club in getting the right players.

Example 2:

Match Code:	WCHE30AST
Interviewer 16:	*A good, all round team display then?*
Jose Mourinho:	*I think so, I think so. I think they're a good team, and when you beat a good team in such an easy way, it's because you have a good performance.*

The Portuguese manager's reply of "*I think so, I think so*" shows his agreement with the interviewer's summary of Chelsea's performance as "*a good, all round team display*". This exchange contains a representative illocutionary point as Jose Mourinho's opinion that beating a good team like Aston Villa requires a good performance is assessable. Since he is merely describing his thoughts on the away team and his view on beating them, the direction of fit is word-to-world. Here his belief of Chelsea's "*good performance*" is showing when he calls Aston Villa as "*a good team*", followed by their victory over them "*in such an easy way*".

There were also two occasions (1.6%) that Jose Mourinho used a combination of a representative and a commissive illocutionary acts in one exchange. The use of such illocutionary act is to explain or show his opinion on something that he had committed to do. An example below shows how two illocutionary acts exist in one speaking turn:

Example 3

Match code:	WCHE10CRP
Interviewer 35:	*Are the brakes off now for the last three games?*
Jose Mourinho:	*Well, what Crystal palace did to us, we need to do, and we need to do too. We need to play Liverpool, West Bromwich Albion and Sunderland with the same dignity that Crystal palace did against us so West Brom doesn't need that. But for Liverpool, they need that because other teams are competing with Liverpool for positions, and maybe in the last game with Sunderland, we need because other teams will be also waiting for that game so it's the nature of the country, this is the pure feeling of football which is to play to win if you need or don't need so obviously I want to give a few days off to these boys but when they're back, we're going to try on the last three matches, to get the maximum points.*

Jose Mourinho's answer was representative. His opinion was assessable when he claimed that that every match should be played seriously due to the respect for football, which is a sport played to win. At the end of the exchange, his plan to rest some players and promised to play their best to win maximum points are examples of commissive illocutionary point. Since Jose Mourinho was merely fitting his words to point out his view that all matches should be played with a desire to win, the direction of fit is word-to-world. On the other hand, his attempt to create a reality of resting his players and playing with an objective to gain maximum points to fit his words was an example of a world-to-word direction of fit. Jose Mourinho's use of the verb "*need*" on several

occasions show his certainty that Chelsea would play their remaining matches seriously, not only as a way to show respect to their opponents, but because football, according to him, is "*played to win*". His plan to rest several players and promise to play every remaining match seriously is an example of a speaker's intention of committing himself to certain actions in the future.

Expressive illocutionary acts were also used twice (1.6%) by Jose Mourinho to express his psychological state. In Jose Mourinho's case when the matches were won, he was responding to the interviewer's congratulatory message by thanking him. Another occasion of such illocutionary act was when he expressed his dissatisfaction towards the interviewer's question. An example below shows how Jose Mourinho used an expressive illocutionary act:

Example 4

Match code:	WCHE10EVE
Interviewer 28:	*So emotional things happened so quickly, so when you see the melee after, if you see one of your players has done something wrong, would you take action if they have done anything (wrong)?*
Jose Mourinho:	*Sorry, see you tomorrow.*

The Portuguese manager was not expressing his regret although the word "*sorry*" was used. The typical leave-taking "*see you tomorrow*" expression was not only used in order for him to leave the interview, it also showed his intention that he was not going to answer the interviewer's question. This is an expressive exchange where Jose Mourinho expresses his anger towards the interviewer's question. Since the direction of fit is presupposed, Jose Mourinho was neither committing himself to leave the scene nor recalling his leaving action; this exchange has no direction of fit. In expressive, the

expressed psychological state must be related to a property ascribed with the speaker or hearer. In this case, Jose Mourinho was expressing his dissatisfaction towards the interviewer's question.

Lastly, only once in the matches that were won that Jose Mourinho committed himself to a future task. An example below shows Jose Mourinho's use of a commissive illocutionary act:

Example 5

Match code:	WWHU01CHE
Interviewer 29:	*So now can you have a day-off and celebrate the League Cup win?*
Jose Mourinho:	*Two days. Two days off. I don't want football; I don't want Paris Saint Germain. First of all I want to sleep tomorrow until mid-day.*

In the exchange above, Jose Mourinho's commitments of giving himself a break, staying away from football and sleeping until mid-day gave his answer a commissive illocutionary point. Upon making his commitments, he had to fulfill his words by creating a world where he does not think about football and relax, thus giving this exchange a world-to-word direction of fit. Lastly, the psychological state expressed here is Jose Mourinho's intention of doing something in the future.

With the examples of Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in the winning matches presented, the next section presents examples of another four categories of illocutionary act that were not used by Jose Mourinho when matches were won, but found in matches with the defeat/draw outcome.

4.2.2   Jose Mourinho's Illocutionary Acts after Defeats/Draws

The table below displays the results of the data analysis on the illocutionary acts used by Jose Mourinho in the matches with defeat/draw outcome.

Table 4.2: Jose Mourinho's Illocutionary Act's after Defeats/Draws

Illocutionary Act Category	Frequency of Use (n)	Percentage (%) = n/b x 100%
Representative	52	73.0
Commissive	4	5.6
Directive	5	7.0
Expressive	1	1.4
Declaration	0	0
Representative + Directive	4	5.6
Representative + Commissive	3	4.2
Commissive + Directive	1	1.4
Directive + Expressive	1	1.4
Total (b)	71	100% (± 0.4%)

Compared to matches that were won, there are altogether eight categories of illocutionary acts used by Jose Mourinho in his post-match interviews in matches with defeat/draw outcome. The biggest difference in these two kinds of matches is the use of directives, along with other three directive-inspired illocutionary acts such as (i) representative + directive, (ii) representative + commissive, (iii) commissive + directive and (iii) expressive + directive. These acts were found in Jose Mourinho's post-match interviews after defeats and draws but did not occur when matches were won.

Firstly, directives are used when the speaker expresses a wish/want for the hearer to carry out an action immediately or in the future. In Jose Mourinho's case, directives were used to demand a clearer, more elaborated answer from the interviewer,

as well as indirectly asking the interviewer to stop asking questions that he refused to answer. An example of Jose Mourinho's directive illocutionary acts is given below:

Example 6

Match code:	LWBA30CHE
Interviewer 11:	*It didn't bother some of your supporters tonight; does it bother you to some extent*?
Jose Mourinho:	*Our supporters*?
Interviewer 11:	*Like, they were cheering for you all night, the result didn't bother them, and did it bother you*?

In the conversation above, Jose Mourinho's repeat of "*Our supporters?*" was an illocutionary act to direct the interviewer to restructure his question. The direction-of-fit was world-to-word as it showed his desire to create a world in which the interviewer would repeat his question by using words. Jose Mourinho's psychological state was to express his wish for the hearer to carry out a task; in this case, the Portuguese manager was hoping that his repeating action would be understood so that the interviewer would clarify his question. Lastly, the interviewer's longer, more elaborated question showed Jose Mourinho's directive illocutionary act successfully performed.

Directives were also used with representatives on four occasions (5.6%). When a representative and a directive illocutionary act were used at the same time, Jose Mourinho not only states his views on the interviewer's questions, but also directly/indirectly influenced the interviewer to perform an action. An example of Jose Mourinho's representative + directive illocutionary act is given below:

Example 7

Match code:	DMUT11CHE
Interviewer 2:	*Ok, let's speak about Didier Drogba, he showed today that you didn't just bring him back because of some fairy tale, that's just a sentimental thing to do. What a game he had.*
Jose Mourinho:	*Yeah, but for me as a coach, it's difficult. It's not fair to just speak about Didier when my team was fantastic. I start with the brilliant performance of Courtois and I go through every one of my players until I arrive at the last one, probably Didier. I have to say that they were brilliant, brilliant performance in my opinion, so please.*

In the conversation above, phrases such as "*it's difficult*" and "*it's not fair*" in Jose Mourinho's answering turn highlighted his agreement on the interviewer's opinion on Didier Drogba's performance, giving this exchange a representative illocutionary point. This exchange was also directive because Jose Mourinho could be seen attempting to get the interviewer not to ask further questions about the performances of any individual player, as he preferred to address the players as a team, rather than individually. An example of word-to-world direction of fit was shown Jose Mourinho mentioned Drogba and Thibaut Courtois' performance in this match, while the directive phrase "*so please*" showed a world-to-word direction of fit when Jose Mourinho was trying to get the interviewer to not ask further questions on any individual player. In the first sentence, the expression "*Yeah*" and the comment of "*but for me as a coach, it's difficult*" showed that Jose Mourinho only agreed with the interviewer on the part on Drogba's performance, but not on his addressing any individual player when all the players performed well as a team. As a result, the phrase "*So please*" showed Jose Mourinho's wish that the interviewer would stop asking questions about the contributions of any individual player. His mentioning of his player, starting from Courtois, and until he "*arrives at the last one, probably Didier*" showed his belief of addressing every player's effort, rather than singling out one particular player.

In the match against Burnley, where Chelsea did not win due to some refereeing decisions, Jose Mourinho was found responding to the interviewer's question by committing himself to not answer. He also indirectly influenced the interviewer to stop the interview. An example of Jose Mourinho's expressive illocutionary act is given below:

Example 8

Match code:	DCHE11BUR
Jose Mourinho:	*I can't do that because I'm punished when I refer to these situations and I don't want to be punished. I'll just say that I believe in spite of some clear calls and you all guys are honest people and professional people, and I believe that sometimes the calls can disturb a little bit the truth but I truly believe that you're all honest people, so I repeat: minute thirty, thirty-three, forty-three and sixty-nine.*
Interviewer 7:	*You won't be punished for describing the incidents.*
Jose Mourinho:	*I don't want to describe, because to describe I have to use words that I cannot use, and it's better that we finish (the interview) here.*

In Jose Mourinho's answering turn above, the Portuguese manager showed that he was not influenced by the interviewer's convincing strategy and had committed himself to not describe the moments he had listed with a commissive illocutionary point. His wish to "*finish the interview*" in a suggestive manner with the use of the phrase "*it's better*" showed his attempt to lower the forcefulness of his message to get the interviewer to perform as asked. The direction of fit was world-to-word as Jose Mourinho was attempting to commit himself to not describe the controversial moments, as well as trying to establish a world where the interview is stopped at once. The modals and verbs such as "*don't want*", "*cannot*" and "*have to*" expressed the idea that Jose Mourinho was certain of his commitment to not answer certain questions. Lastly, his

suggestion for the interviewer to stop the interview reflected his wish for the hearer to perform certain tasks.

Lastly, in the same match. Another directive was used by Jose Mourinho to indirectly influence the interviewer to review one of the controversial incidents during the match. An apology at the end of the exchange also showed Jose Mourinho's psychological state that he was sorry for not being able to continue the interview. An example of such combined use of directive and expressive illocutionary acts is given below:

Example 9

Match code:	DCHE11BUR
Interviewer 7:	*Okay, will you tell us more about the sending off of Matic, because he was very aggrieved with the tackle that he received.*
Jose Mourinho:	*It was in the minute sixty-nine. I'm sorry.*

The directive illocutionary point demonstrated in the Portuguese manager's answering turn was shown through his attempt to get the interviewer to watch the match highlights, particularly the incident in minute sixty-nine. Jose Mourinho's apology after had an expressive illocutionary point as he expressed his desire to not continue the interview. The direction of fit is world-to-word, as Jose Mourinho was seen here influencing the interviewer to review the incident in minute sixty-nine. His apology did not have a direction of fit, as he was neither describing his action to not wanting to be interviewed, nor committing himself to not continuing the interview. Jose Mourinho's psychological state expressed in this exchange showed his intention to direct the hearer (the interviewer) into reviewing the incident on minute sixty-nine.

Lastly, his apology showed his desire of not wanting to continue to be interviewed further.

4.2.3 Comparison of Jose Mourinho's Illocutionary Acts after Wins and Defeats/Draws

With all types of illocutionary acts used by Jose Mourinho in all the matches explained, the next section discusses the three main observed phenomena listed below:

(i)   The dominance of representative utterances

(ii)   The zero appearance of declarations

(iii)   The use of directives in defeat/draw matches only

4.2.3.1 The Dominance of Representative Illocutionary Acts

Regardless of the match outcome, the purpose of conducting post-match interviews is to allow football interviewers to obtain the coaches/managers' opinions on different aspects of the match. As Caldwell (2009) pointed out, as interviewees, they are expected to evaluate the performance of their team, the performance of the opposition, the opposition coach, the referee and so on. In Jose Mourinho's case, most of his illocutionary acts in post-match interviews were representative, due to the interviewers' questions that mostly intended to find out his thoughts/opinions about his own team and the opposition team's performance, his game plan, his thoughts on certain player's performance and the referee of the match.

Searle (1976) pointed out that in representative illocutionary acts, the utterances' truthfulness must be assessable. In this case, most of Jose Mourinho's utterances were in the form of opinions and claims that are commendable (true or false). For example, when he said that he was standing too far away to comment on Azpilicueta's red card offence (match code: WCRP12CHE), it is possible to review whether he was telling the truth by replaying the match.

Most of Jose Mourinho's utterances had a word-to-world direction of fit. For example, when asked about whether his team could stay unbeaten for the whole season (match code: DSUN00CHE), he stated his belief that it is impossible as Chelsea would win matches, but would also lose some. Given that Jose Mourinho's claim had one purpose, as Platts (1979) claimed, which was to aim to be true so that it fit the reality where losing is a part of football matches, the direction of fit is word-to-world.

Lastly, most of his utterances showed his psychological state of expressing beliefs. In Siebel's (2003) view, to assert is to express a belief. In Jose Mourinho's case, when he asserted that it was still too early to predict the winner of the league (match code: WCHE21QPR), his psychological state was to express his belief that football is a game with unpredictable outcomes.

In conclusion, the dominance of representative utterances in his interviews, regardless of the match outcome, was due to the purpose of most of the questions, which was to collect Jose Mourinho's opinions, views, or thoughts of the match.

4.2.3.2 The Zero Appearance of Declarations

Having not a single declaration in all Jose Mourinho's 195 illocutionary acts is definitely a phenomenon worth discussing. To discuss such a phenomenon, the characteristics of declarations need to be identified.

According to Searle (1976) in his taxonomy of illocutionary act classification, declarations refer to utterances that, upon performed successfully, bring about the correspondence between the propositional content and reality. In other words, successful performance of a declaration guarantees that the propositional content corresponds to the world. For example, the moment a father names his newborn baby

"John", the baby then obtains an identity; if a pastor pronounces a couple husband and wife, then the couple becomes each other's husband and wife.

As shown in the data analysis, none of Jose Mourinho's utterances had the effect of changing the status of the referred objects, nor the reality of the world. Looking at all his illocutionary acts classified so far, the representatives used by Portuguese manager's consisted of claims, opinions, and recalls of events; his commitments of not talking about controversial refereeing decisions and his planning of giving a few days break to himself and the players are classified as commissives. There were also some expressives when he thanked the interviewers for their time and when he expressed his disliking towards a question; and finally, his directive illocutionary acts were used to influence interviewers to not ask him about questions he does not intend to answer.

It is the nature of post-match interviews, where the purpose of interviewing the coaches/managers is to hear from them about the match their team just finished playing moments ago that limits the use of declarations. For Jose Mourinho, declarations with a purpose to change the status of a referred-to person are more likely to occur when, for example, he names Eden Hazard as Chelsea Football Club's new captain, or when he declares that Diego Costa's position is changed to a midfielder, instead of his usual position as a striker.

4.2.3.3 The Use of Directives in Defeat/Draw Matches Only

Compared to matches that were won (25 matches) with only four illocutionary act categories, which are (i) representatives, (ii) commissives, (iii) expressives and (iv) representatives + commissives, there were altogether eight illocutionary act categories in matches with defeat/draw outcome (11 matches): (i) representatives, (ii) commissives, (iii) directives, (iv) expressives, (v) representatives + directives, (vi)

representatives + commissives, (vii) directives + commissives and (viii) directives + expressives.

Both won and defeat/draw matches saw Jose Mourinho using the same types of illocutionary acts. In other words, the illocutionary acts used when matches were won can also be found in Jose Mourinho's post-match interviews when matches ended with a defeat or a draw.

In the matches that were won, most representatives were used to express the speaker's beliefs. A commissive illocutionary act was used by Jose Mourinho when he claimed that he would be taking two days off (match code: WWHU01CHE). An expressive was also used when Jose Mourinho expressed his anger at a question by the interview (match code: WEVE01CHE). Lastly, a Jose Mourinho's answer consisted of illocutionary acts classified under a combined categories of representative + commissive (match code: WEVE36CHE) when he committed himself to not answering questions about Loic Remy and declaring that a few days break will be given to the players (match code: WCHE10CRP). The way of how these mentioned illocutionary acts was used when matches were won is similar to matches with a defeat/draw outcome.

However, the difference in Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in matches with win and defeat/draw lies in his use of directives in some of the matches Chelsea did not manage to win due to some refereeing decisions. In those matches, directives were used implicitly to stop the interviewers to ask further questions about penalties or red cards. The zero appearance of directives in the matches that were won explains that there was no need express the speaker's wish to have the hearer carrying out certain task, such as not asking questions about refereeing decisions.

With Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts pertaining to the first research question answered, the next section answers the second research question – How does adversarial questioning influence Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts?

4.3   Adversarial Questioning in Jose Mourinho's Post-match Interviews

To analyse the influence of the manner interview questions were asked on Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts, questions that were asked in the post-match interviews need to be presented. The table below shows the frequency of the types of adversarial questioning in the post-match interviews. Matches are divided according to their match outcome and interviewers' questions are also categorised according to Clayman and Heritage's Question Analysis System (2002) which the researcher has expanded on.

Table 4.3: Frequency of Interviewers' Questions Asked in Matches

Interviewer's Question Category	Match Outcome			
	Win		Defeat/Draw	
	Number of Occurrence (n)	% = n/b x 100%	Number of Occurrence (n)	% = n/b x 100%
Assertiveness	69	55.6	26	36.6
Initiative	20	16.1	9	12.6
Directness	-	-	1	1.4
Hostility	-	-	1	1.4
Persistence	-	-	4	5.6
Neutrality	11	8.8	8	11.2
Initiative + Assertiveness	21	16.9	15	21.1
Initiative + Directness	1	0.8	-	-
Directness + Assertiveness	1	0.8	5	7.0
Persistence + Assertiveness	1	0.8	2	2.8
Total (b)	**124**	**100%**	**71**	**100%** (± 0.4%)

Apart from the questions which can be categorised under the 5-dimension QAS, the result above also reveals a type of neutral questioning which does not fit in any of the five QAS dimensions. The question of neutrality in broadcast interview has attracted diverse definitions and views over the years. Therefore, there is a need to address interviewers' questions that are not adversarial in this study.

The result shows that the interviewers' questions under most of the QAS categories in the table presented above were asked in most of the matches regardless of the outcome, except questions under the categories of directness, hostility, persistence and initiative + directness. Some examples are given below to show how these questions were asked in matches with different outcomes.

4.3.1 Assertiveness

Example 10:

Match code:	DMCT11CHE
Interviewer 1:	*Jose, it was an incredible match to watch with an incredible ending. Should you have won against ten men (playing)?*
Jose Mourinho:	*No, against ten men, we won the game. The same ten men were (giving) fantastic reactions and they gave everything they could to try to equalize so I think when the game gets emotional, doesn't matter if they're ten, eleven, or nine. I played with eight (players) with Inter (Milan) against Sampdoria and I didn't lose. When the game gets emotional, the numbers are not important. When the game is tactical, yes. When the game was tactical, we felt that, even before Zabaleta's sent-off, we're sure we put in a different intention. We were trying to win at that time. Against ten (players), we tried, we scored, we had the game apparently under control, we hit the post with Diego. Then they scored. When they scored the last five minutes after the 1-1, the game got emotional and it was obviously in that period, they're psychologically stronger than us and with the crowd behind them so I think maybe the result is a fair result.*

The interviewer started by greeting Jose Mourinho by his first name, which showed his intention to form a friendly relationship with the manager. The suggestive question "*Should you have won against ten men (playing)?*" also showed the interviewer's assertiveness that Chelsea has an advantage over the opposition with a player less. The tag "*Should you?*" saw the interviewer's effort to prompt Jose Mourinho into answering "*yes*". On the other hand, Jose Mourinho's view on the emotional side of football matches, as well as his assessment of both teams' performance, were assessable, hence the illocutionary point of representative. Most part of Jose Mourinho's answer recalled what happened during the match. The direction of fit is word-to-world because Jose Mourinho is merely fitting words into incidents which had already happened. On his beliefs, Jose Mourinho's "*no*" at the beginning highlighted his belief (disagreement) with the interviewer's assertion of a guaranteed win over the team with one player less. He then tried to support his belief by recalling his past experience, where he experienced similar situation. The repeated use of "*we*" expresses his belief that managers and players are inseparable as a team. Lastly, he attempted to support his belief of the significance emotional strength in football matches by highlighting what he saw in the opposition team in the last five minutes of the match.

Example 11:

Match code:	WCHE30AST
Interviewer 16:	*Jose, looks like a strong performance, how do you assess it?*
Jose Mourinho:	*Yeah, very good from the beginning and even in the period of the game when the result wasn't 1-0, which is a result that kept the game open. It always looked close because we always had control of the game, so I think it's a very solid performance.*

In the interviewer's questioning turn, the tilted preface "*looks like a strong performance*" before the main question "*how do you assess it?*" expressed the interviewer's assertiveness about Chelsea's performance. In Jose Mourinho's turn, his "*Yeah*" expression showed his agreement with the interviewer that Chelsea delivered "*a strong performance*". His reply contained a representative illocutionary point as Jose Mourinho's opinion was assessable that Chelsea has been playing well from the beginning to the extent that they looked like scoring every time chances appeared. Since Jose Mourinho was merely describing his thoughts on Chelsea's overall performance in this match, the direction of fit was word-to-world. Lastly, the use of the word "*even*" in the phrase "*even in the period of the game when the result wasn't 1-0*" showed his belief with certainty that that Chelsea "*always had control of the game*".

4.3.2 Initiative

Example 12:

Match code:	LTOT53CHE
Interviewer 6:	*Finally, Manchester City, they are really talking about it now, do you have any reactions of the news that Frank Lampard is going to stay with them until the end of the season now?*
Jose Mourinho:	*Nope, they can bring any player from New York FC, they can do (like that). They can bring anyone and nobody is going to stop them. So if they find other good players from the New York team they can bring to Manchester City.*

The interviewer first set the constraints on Jose Mourinho's answer by prefacing about the talking point of Manchester City and Frank Lampard's transfer by stating "*they are really talking about it now*". His intention of getting Jose Mourinho to share his thoughts in this transfer is due to his knowledge of the relationship shared between Lampard and Jose Mourinho. Jose Mourinho's reply contained a representative illocutionary point, as his reply of "*Nope*" expresses his belief that Manchester City's

player transfer strategy was acceptable, which was also assessable. Since his reply was about the truth that a club is allowed to bring in another player from another club. Therefore, the direction of fit was word-to-world. Lastly, the psychological state expressed here is Jose Mourinho's belief that it was totally acceptable for Manchester City to sanction the transfer of a player from New York FC. His mentioning of "*any player*" and "*anyone*" spoke about his belief that all players are transferrable, therefore, Frank Lampard was no different and his transfer did not worth all the media and public attention.

Example 13:

Match code:	WCHE42SWA
Interviewer 12:	*How do you assess the Premiere League now? Bear in mind that the contenders have dropped points now and the fact that your team are the only one with a hundred percent record.*
Jose Mourinho:	*You know, there are four matches (played only so far). Four matches is just the beginning. But obviously it's better to have twelve points than four, five, six or seven. We have twelve, we played so well. We deserved the points, we scored goals, I think we deserved to be there (on top of the league). At the beginning of September, it's nothing.*

A statement prefaced "*your team are the only one with a hundred percent record*" after the main question set constrains on Jose Mourinho's answers about his point of view on the competition to win the Premier League. The phrase "*bear in mind*" in the interviewer's questioning turn served as a reminder for Jose Mourinho to answer his question by keeping the other title contenders' misfortune and Chelsea's victory in mind. On the interviewer's question about the situation of the Premier League title runners, Jose Mourinho's reply of "*You know, there are four matches (played only so far). Four matches is just the beginning.*" showed his opinion that it was difficult to predict the outcome of the league with only four matches played so far, which was assessable and gave Jose Mourinho's answer a representative illocutionary point. Since

Jose Mourinho was merely describing his thoughts on Chelsea winning all their first four matches and they should not be celebrating too early, the direction of fit was word-to-world. Lastly, there are a few discourse markers in this exchange which showed Jose Mourinho's belief in Chelsea's deserving league leader position in an unpredictable league. "*We played well*" and "*we scored goals*" express his belief in Chelsea's brilliant performance to win their first four matches. The phrase "*Four matches are just the beginning*" and "*it's nothing*" marked his opinion and belief in the unpredictability of the Premier League.

4.3.3   Initiative + Assertiveness

Example 14:

Match Code:	DCHE11SHT
Interviewer 8:	*I know it was the game at Southampton earlier this season before you said maybe it was a campaign, is the feeling still there?*
Jose Mourinho:	*No, I don't want to answer this.*

The interviewer took the initiative by prefacing the main question with Jose Mourinho's earlier "*campaign*" claim, in which the Portuguese manager claimed that Chelsea was treated unfairly by the Football Association. The interviewer also set constraint on Jose Mourinho to give a positive respond on the "*campaign*" claim with the use of a tilted "*I know*" which served to remind and focus the Portuguese manager on the issue of Chelsea's unfair treatment. On the other hand, Jose Mourinho's answer contained a commissive illocutionary point, where Jose Mourinho commited himself to not answer questions regarding controversial refereeing decisions whenever he was asked, as mentioned in his few interviews prior to this one. The direction of fit was world-to-word when Jose Mourinho showed an attempt to create a world of him not answering questions involving questionable refereeing decision by using the words "*I*

don't want to answer this". Lastly, the psychological state expressed here is Jose Mourinho's intention to commit himself to a certain action. By using a declarative sentence – "*I don't want to answer this*", he was committing himself to not answer such questions anymore.

Example 15:

Match Code:	WSWA05CHE
Interviewer 26:	*You are now five points clear, is it important that you play ahead of Manchester City that you get those wins?*
Jose Mourinho:	*No, I don't think so, for us is that if you have an advantage of two points to start the next game against them, it can be four (points), it can be five (points), but that is out of our control, and under our control is to win the game here today and to play against Manchester City in front of them.*

The interviewer prepared Jose Mourinho for his question with a statement preface that Chelsea had won five more points than their title rival which was Manchester City. The question was asked in a suggestive manner to confirm with Jose Mourinho whether playing before them gave the players an advantage. Jose Mourinho's reply of "*No*" showed his disagreement with the interviewer that it was important to start playing before their title rival. Jose Mourinho's answer contained a representative illocutionary point, as his thoughts on the importance of a victory and the unpredictability of football matches are assessable. Since Jose Mourinho was merely fitting his words to express his view on what being the most important in football matches and how unpredictable they can be, the direction of fit was word-to-world. Lastly, Jose Mourinho's belief that it was more practical to focus on objectives that were achievable at that time, rather than relying on luck was shown when he stated that he placed more focus on Chelsea's victory rather than the match result of Manchester City against their opponent. His explanation of "*if you have an advantage of two points*

to start the next game against them, it can be four, it can be five, but that is out of our

control" showed his firm belief that the outcome of their title rival's match was not in

his hands.

4.3.4   Directness + Assertiveness

Example 16:

Match code:	LNEW21CHE
Interviewer 4:	*Would you agree that your team was not at their best today?*
Jose Mourinho:	*No, we created lots of chances in the first-half. In the second-half, the top of the unlucky was that we hit the post, and the next situation was that they (the opponent) go and they scored a goal as a consequence of a rebound. They were very lucky, we were very unlucky. That's football, congratulations to them, and no problem with my players.*

The interviewer was attempting to formulate his question in an indirect way to

preserve the face of Jose Mourinho by asking for his willingness to answer his question

with the use of an other-referencing frame "*would you*". He was also suggestive when

he suggested that "*was not at their best today*", as it reflected his own opinion and

thoughts about Chelsea's performance in that match. Jose Mourinho's answer contained

a representative illocutionary point. His reply of "*no*", which shows his opinion that

Chelsea was defeated simply of being unlucky and there was "*no problem*" with his

players, is assessable. Since Jose Mourinho was merely fitting his words to describe his

disagreement with the idea that Chelsea was not good enough by listing the some

incidents to support his argument, the direction of fit was word-to-world. Lastly, Jose

Mourinho's idea/belief that Chelsea was beaten for being unlucky comes from his

comparison of the way his team conceded goals and the way their opponent scored their

goals. His comments on Chelsea's poor luck can be traced at the beginning of the

exchange "*we created lots of chances in the first-half* "and "*the top of the unlucky was*

that we hit the post". While his comment for their opponent's lucky, effortless goal is clear when he said "*the next situation was that they (the opponent) go and they scored a goal as a consequence of a rebound.*" To sum up his comparison, he ended the turn with "*They were very lucky, we were very unlucky.*"

Example 17:

Match code:	WAST12CHE
Interviewer 27:	*If you don't mind I'm saying so, this week you seemed to play things very low key, you didn't seem as talkative just perhaps you normally are. It's good to see you back in your familiar form, with a smile on your face. Has there been a reason for that this week?*
Jose Mourinho:	*BBC.*

In his questioning turn, the interviewer tried to carefully formulating his question with the use of a self-referencing frame – "*If you don't mind I'm saying so*" to mitigate the forcefulness of his question. His use of the word "*seem*" showed his opinion that Jose Mourinho, for the previous week, was not happy as he was "*not as talkative as he normally is*". At the end of his answer, the interviewer also showed his intention to find out the reason of Jose Mourinho's return to "*his familiar form*". The Portuguese manager's answer of "*BBC*" contains a representative illocutionary point. Here he gave the reason that BBC had been the reason for him to rediscover his old self. However, it was only assessable by himself whether the broadcasting corporation had been the reason for the return of his cheerful mood. Since Jose Mourinho was merely fitting his words to claim that BBC was the reason of his cheerful mood, the direction of fit was word-to-world. Lastly, Jose Mourinho's "*BBC*" claim showed his belief in the cause of his return to his old self from a series of negativity.

Apart from interviewers' questions which were found in post-match interviews of matches with both match outcomes, there was a question which only appeared in a

post-match interview of a match resulted in Chelsea being defeated. An example of such question is given below:

4.3.5 Hostility

Example 18:

Match code:	LTOT53CHE
Interviewer 6:	*How do you feel your team performed defensively today?*
Jose Mourinho:	*You know, I think we made some defensive mistakes, some individual defensive mistakes. It was not easy for my defenders to cope with a good Chadly, and especially a good Kane. But it was also very difficult for Tottenham defenders to cope with an Amazing Hazard, and a good Diego Costa. And you can speak about the results, you can focus on the results, you can focus on important moments of the game, and I prefer to just focus on the results, because if I focus on the crucial moments of the game, you know what I have to say, because you have exactly the same opinion as I have and you know that was a crucial minute of the game where the game could go for a 2-0 and game over.*

It is obvious that Chelsea did not defend well to concede five goals. This interviewer's question can be considered as a move challenging Jose Mourinho's coaching ability as he was the one responsible for Chelsea's defensive qualities. Apart from analyzing both teams' defensive performance, Jose Mourinho's idea about a controversial moment during the match after Chelsea scored their first goal also showed an illocutionary point of representative. Since Jose Mourinho was merely describing Tottenham and Chelsea's defensive performance, the direction of fit was word-to-world. The first part of Jose Mourinho's answer saw him expressing his belief in both teams' defensive performance by analyzing the difficulty of both teams to play against some of the players he mentioned, which referred to Eden Hazard, Diego Costa, Harry Kane and Nacer Chadly. His intentional mentioning of the "*crucial moments*" expressed his

intention to make his feelings known about the controversial decision to not award a penalty to his team during the earlier phase of the match, although in a more reserved, indirect way. His claim that the interviewer "*knowing what he has to say*", and the interviewer "*have exactly the same opinion as he has*" or how the interviewer *"knows that was a crucial minute of the game"* were a demonstration of his strategy to pressure the interviewer to agree with his claim of the referee's decision.

4.3.6 Neutrality

Example 19:

Match Code:	LWBA30CHE
Interviewer 11:	*You think he had options, the referee to not send Cesc off?*
Jose Mourinho:	*Of course, of course, I think a referee with a different status, a referee with a different control of the game, goes there, and words are many, many times much more important than cards. You know, some cards you have to give because we're speaking about aggression. But a childish reaction he goes there in a couple of words in a game where nobody plays absolutely for nothing. I think, it's quite difficult to accept but it was not because of the referee that we lost the game.*

This question is not adversarial as the interviewer attempted to summarise Jose Mourinho's point of view in the previous exchange with the word "*options*", which refers to Jose Mourinho's assertion that Cesc Fabregas' case could be solved *"with a couple of words"*.

110

Example 20:

Match Code:	WCHE30TOT
Interviewer 22:	*Do you feel the way you took control of that match in the first-half with those two quick goals almost underlined the strength you have at the moment?*
Jose Mourinho:	*You know, I have to be fair. I think it would be normal as a consequence of the way Tottenham started. If Tottenham scored before us, then we would have to chase the game. I'm really happy with the points, the performance, the spirit and also the way the players understood the different moments of the game, but I think for Tottenham, it was too heavy (for them), as they did not play for this result.*

In the exchange above, the interviewer intended to find out if Chelsea's strength was shown through the way the two goals were scored during the first-half. The way the question was asked reflected the interviewer's non-adversarial questioning, as the question is neither suggestive, tilted nor reflecting the interviewer's assertion. Jose Mourinho's answer contained a representative illocutionary point. His views of Tottenham's defensive mistakes, Chelsea's understanding and reading of the game, as well as Tottenham's undeserving defeat are assessable. Since he was merely fitting his words to describe both team's performance, the direction of fit was word-to-world. His declaration of "*I'm really happy with the points, the performance, the spirit and also the way the players understood the different moments of the game*" highlighted his belief in the result and Chelsea's performance. Finally, the phrase "*it was too heavy (for them)*" showed his belief that it was undeserving for Tottenham to lose the match.

4.4 Influences of Adversarial Questioning on Jose Mourinho's Illocutionary Acts

With the examples of each interviewers' question category shown, this section will aim to discuss three noticeable phenomena obtained from the data analysis result conducted on Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts when answering to different interviewer questions. To achieve that, a break-down of the frequency of each Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts used in matches with both match outcomes needs to be presented. The table below shows the frequency of Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts (categorised) when answering to the interviewers' questions in all matches divided into two match outcomes: win and defeat/draw.

Table 4.4: Data Analysis of Jose Mourinho's Illocutionary Act by Interviewers' Questions

Interviewer's Question Category (QAS)	Illocutionary Act Category	Match Outcome	
		Win (%)	Defeat/Draw (%)
Assertiveness	Representative	54.0	26.7
	Directive	-	4.2
	Commissive	0.8	-
	Representative + Commissive	0.8	2.8
	Representative + Directive	-	2.8
Initiative	Representative	15.3	7.0
	Directive	-	-
	Commissive	-	1.4
	Representative + Commissive	0.8	1.4
	Representative + Directive	-	2.8
Directness	Commissive	-	1.4
Neutrality	Representative	7.2	9.8
	Expressive	1.6	1.4
Hostility	Representative	-	1.4
Persistence	Representative	-	4.2
	Directive	-	1.4
Initiative + Assertiveness	Representative	16.1	18.3
	Directive	-	1.4
	Commissive	-	1.4
	Expressive	0.8	-
Initiative + Directness	Representative	0.8	-
Directness + Assertiveness	Representative	0.8	4.2
	Commissive	-	1.4
	Directive + Expressive	-	1.4
Persistence + Assertiveness	Representative	0.8	1.4
	Commissive + Directive	-	1.4
Total		100% (± 0.2%)	100% (± 0.4%)

The result above reveals that hostile and persistent questioning only occurred when matches were lost/drawn, as such kinds of questioning were not used at all when Chelsea won their matches. Hostile questioning were used once, while persistent questioning occurred for four times when Chelsea lost/drew. Lastly, a higher degree of directness was demonstrated in the interviewers' questioning after matches were lost/drawn; such questions were asked for a total of six times when Chelsea failed to win, compared to only once in matches that were won.

With all types of adversarial questioning strategies used by the interviewers in all the post-match interviews revealed, the next sub-sections discuss the three main observed phenomena listed below:

(i)   The difference of interviewing approach

(ii)   The hostility of the interviewers' questions

(iii)   The influences of match outcome on the interviewers' indirectness

4.4.1   The Difference of Interviewing Approach

Apart from being "mostly representative" in Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts, the main difference lies in the variety of illocutionary acts used by the Portuguese manager under different match outcomes. Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in matches that were won can be described as "focused", with only three categories of non-representative illocutionary acts, which are (i) commissive, (ii) expressive and (iii) representative + commissive. While the mentioned illocutionary acts were also used after defeat/draw matches, the addition of (i) directive, (ii) directive + expressive, (iii) directive + representative and (iv) directive + commissive made Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts more "varied" when matches were not won.

Such occurrence explains the difference of interviewing approach, which applied differently under different match outcomes. When matches were won, the interviewers'

objectives were to "obtain", rather than "pursue". An example is the difference in the number of times suggestive questions were used at the end of a question. In matches with defeat/draw outcome, only three times (2.5%, out of 124 questions asked) suggestive questions were used (match code: DSUN00CHE, LNEW21CHE and DCHE11LIV) compared to a total of eight (match code: WCHE20LCT, WEVE36CHE, WCHE20ARS, WSTK02CHE, WAST12CHE, WHUL23CHE and WCHE21STK) when matches were won (11.2%, out of 71 questions asked).

Negative interrogations such as *don't you, isn't it,* and *shouldn't you* used in suggestive questions are also considered as "vehicles of assertion" in interview practices (Heritage, 2002, pp. 1426). In other words, tag questions are mainly used to limit interviewees' answering options into yes/no only. In the case of Jose Mourinho's post-match interviews, interviewers often expressed their own opinions which contributed to Chelsea's victory over their opponents. Examples are shown below:

a)   "*Were you concerned at half-time because you have made a great start, haven't you? Two goals in the first nine minutes but then Hull had really taken the game too.*" (Match code: WHUL23CHE)

b)   "*You mentioned Thibaut Courtois coming to the fore, that's the moment goalkeepers prove their point, isn't it?*" (Match code: WCHE20LCT)

With negative interrogations being "assertive", as Heritage (2002) pointed out, most tag questions were used in questions categorised under assertiveness and assertiveness + initiative, thus explaining Jose Mourinho's majority use of representatives when being assertively questioned using negative interrogatives. The domination of representatives in post-match interviews after matches Chelsea won is also due to the unneeded avoidance of certain questions by Jose Mourinho, which will be discussed in the next discussion topic.

4.4.2 The Hostility of the Interviewers' Questions

The hostility of the interviewers was more obviously demonstrated in matches with defeat/draw outcome, thus inviting counter-measures from Jose Mourinho to avoid answering such questions with the use of directive and other directive-inspired illocutionary acts, such as (i) directive, (ii) directive + representative, (iii) directive + commissive and (iv) directive + expressive in matches ended with defeat/draw.

Unlike post-match interviews after matches that were won, results show that Chelsea's inability to secure victory over their opponents often invited Jose Mourinho to use directives in his answers to respond to the interviewers' questions by suggesting the interviewer to be stopped at once (match code: DCHE11BUR), indirectly influencing the interviewers to stop asking similar questions (DMUT11CHE), or to signal his intention to leave the interview after telling the interviewer to review some of the controversial moments (match code: DCHE11BUR). The use of these directive illocutionary acts were mostly due to the influences from the interviewers' relentless pursuing of Jose Mourinho's answers the topics such as some of the referees' controversial decisions (DCHE11BUR), the campaigning of referees and managers against Chelsea (LTOT53CHE). Some of the examples of hostile questioning which invited a directive responses from Jose Mourinho are given below:

Example 21:

Match code:	DCHE11BUR
Interviewer 7:	*Well, can you talk us through the moments because the moments are individually so people might not know what you're referring to.*
Jose Mourinho:	*I can't. I can't do that.*
Interviewer 7:	*Why not?*
Jose Mourinho:	*I can't do that because I'm punished when I refer to these situations and I don't want to be punished. I'll just say that I believe in spite of some clear calls and you all guys are honest people and professional people, and I believe that sometimes the calls can disturb a little bit the truth but I truly believe that you're all honest people, so I repeat: minute thirty, thirty-three, forty-three and sixty-nine.*
Interviewer 7:	*You won't be punished for describing the incidents.*
Jose Mourinho:	*I don't want to describe, because to describe I have to use words that I cannot use, and it's better that we finish (the interview) here.*

By asking "*why not?*" in his second questioning turn, the interviewer was seen to have given up on asking about Matic's sending-off and was showing persistence in finding out about the reasons Jose Mourinho does not want to answer such questions, even after being told by him that he "*can't do that*". The interviewer could be seen to have shown his eagerness to pursue Jose Mourinho into describing the controversial incidents by suggesting that there would be no punishments for describing what happened in the match afterwards. In the last line, a directive illocutionary act was used by Jose Mourinho when he suggested the interview to be finished at once even after being persuaded by the into describing the controversial incidents.

Example 22:

Match code:	LTOT53CHE
Interviewer 6:	*What's your assessment on the title race because does today prove that you never know what is going to happen because it is so unpredictable?*
Jose Mourinho:	*You know, every game is unpredictable but there are things in the game that are becoming predictable.*
Interviewer 6:	*Which are?*
Jose Mourinho:	*Forget it.*

The interviewer's question – "*which are*?" before the last line was asked to pursue Jose Mourinho for a more elaborated answer about something that were becoming more predictable according to Jose Mourinho (Line 2). Such questioning is considered abusing the "neutralism" in journalistic interviews, which resulting in the expansion of the QAS with another category – persistence by Huls and Varwijk, (2010).

With interviewers showing persistence in pursuing Jose Mourinho for answers regarding refereeing decisions and controversial incidents after defeats/draws, the Portuguese manager often evaded answering them using directive illocutionary acts such as suggesting to stop the interview or replying with a question instead of an answer, which according to Kantara (2012, pp. 184), is one of the "resistance techniques" aimed to change the question agenda.

4.4.3 The Influence of Match Outcome on the Interviewers' Indirectness

The concept of directness in media interviews refers to the extent of straightforwardness (asking blunt, direct questions) or indirectness applied by interviewers when questioning their interviewees. The extent of directness in the post-match interviewers' questions undeniably deserves being studied, given that interview

questions with indirectness strategies were mostly asked (six times) in matches with defeat/draw outcome compared to matches that were won, where such questions were only asked once.

To explain the occurrence of indirect questioning in defeat/draw matches, the rationale behind the application of indirect strategies in the interview questions need to be understood first and foremost. In his study of neutrality in political interviews, Raijmaeker (2012) claimed that interviewers tend to apply politeness strategies such as self-referencing question frames or other-referencing question frames to protect their "neutralistic stance". For example, the indirect question "*Would you agree that your team was not at their best today*? (Match code: LNEW21CHE)" saw the interviewer attempting to formulate his question in an indirect way to preserve the face of Jose Mourinho by asking about his willingness to agree to the idea that the players' performance was below par with the use of an other-referencing question frame - "*would you?*". Other examples of indirect questions and Jose Mourinho's responses are as follow:

Example 23:

Match code:	LTOT53CHE
Interviewer 6:	*Well, are you happy with the way the game went and the referee's decision, the official's decision? Any arguments that you lost the game fairly and squarely?*
Jose Mourinho:	*Why do you ask*?
Interviewer 6:	*Well, purely because you were quite angry with certain decisions and some penalty appeals that you feel did not go your way so I just wonder what do you feel, is it a fair result over the performance of your team today?*

The use of the conjunction "*because*" and the adverb "*quite*" showed the interviewer's assumption (own opinion) that Jose Mourinho was angry due to unfair refereeing decisions made against Chelsea by the referee as mentioned in the first question. The interviewer then showed his attempt to reduce the forcefulness of his question with a self-referencing frame by prefacing his question with "so *I just wonder*" in the last line.

Example 24:

Match code:	DCHE11BUR
Interviewer 7:	*Did everything hinge on the sending off that changed everything today?*
Jose Mourinho:	*No. I think there were four moments of the game where you can write a story of the game; minute thirty, minute thirty-three, minute forty-three and minute sixty-nine. I'll repeat for you, I'll make it easier for you: minute thirty, thirty-three, forty-three and sixty-nine. The game had four moments and don't ask me more questions because I don't answer.*
Interviewer 7:	*Well, can you talk us through the moments because the moments are individually so people might not know what you're referring to.*
Jose Mourinho:	*I can't, I can't do that.*
Interviewer 7:	*Okay, will you tell us more about the sending off of Matic, because he was very aggrieved with the tackle that he received.*
Jose Mourinho:	*It was in the minute sixty-nine. I'm sorry.*

Here the interviewer took a cautious stance in asking his second question. Instead of directly asking Jose Mourinho to describe the controversial moments, he used an *other-referencing* frame (*can you...*) in his second questioning turn to reduce the

coercion level in his question about the controversial moments which caused Jose Mourinho to not win the match. Instead of stating his intention to obtain Jose Mourinho's opinions, the interviewer claimed that it is for the audience's reading to try to not offend the Portuguese manager. Before the end of the interview, knowing that his question could provoke Jose's anger, the interviewer tried to be cautious by asking about Matic's red card decision with an *other-referencing* frame (*will you...*) to make his question less forceful.

Both examples show that indirect questions, though formulated by interviewers to avoid potential face loss of their interviewees as Huls and Varwijk's (2010) pointed out, did not always invite positive responses or cooperation from Jose Mourinho, as he still decided to use directive and commissive illocutionary acts to i) suggest the interview to be stopped at once and ii) commit himself to not giving answers to questions about controversial refereeing decisions as shown in the two conversations above. In other words, Jose Mourinho's uncooperative behavior towards interviewers' indirect questions came from his reluctance to answer questions which he considered "risky" regardless of how the questions were formulated.

4.5   Conclusion

In the findings pertaining to Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in matches that were won, representatives (96.0%) were used the most. Such acts were also used the most by the Portuguese manager when he could not manage to win. Three phenomena in the use of illocutionary acts by Jose Mourinho were observed and explained, namely the dominance of representatives the zero appearance of declarations and the use of directives in matches with the defeat/draw outcome only. On the other hand, interviewers were using assertive questions the most when questioning Jose Mourinho regardless of the outcome of the matches. The findings also showed the

difference of interviewing objective depending on the outcome of the matches. The interviewers tend to show more hostility and aggression towards Jose Mourinho when matches ended in defeat/draw. Lastly, there were also more indirectness shown in their questioning when matches were not won.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

5.1   Introduction

The last chapter of this dissertation concludes the research findings in the previous chapter in section 5.2. In section 5.3, the researcher states the recommendations for future research.

5.2   Summary of Findings

The present study aims to investigate the influences of match results in sports television interview in the context of professional football in England, particularly on the use of illocutionary acts by the former first team head coach of Chelsea football club, Jose Mourinho, as well as the adversarialness in the football journalists' interviewing. The decision of such research goal was due to an understanding in the importance of match results in modern competitive sports, which led the researcher into featuring wins, loses or draws as the independent variables for this research to observe the adversarialness in the interviewers' questioning and Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in his answering.

The findings have revealed that representative illocutionary acts were mostly used in Jose Mourinho's answers regardless of the match results. Despite being different in terms of the way he used his illocutionary acts (only four varieties of illocutionary act usage in the winning matches, compared to eight varieties in matches with defeat/draw result), representative utterances were used mostly by Jose Mourinho to express his thoughts, opinions and point of views regarding matches that were played before the post-match interviews were held.

In terms of difference in Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts when matches were won or lost/drawn, it was Jose Mourinho's use of directive illocutionary acts in the

matches Chelsea were defeated/drawn that set these two situations apart. The findings have revealed that of all the four categories of illocutionary act used by Jose Mourinho when matches were won, none of the categories consisted of directives. Searle (1977) pointed out that directives are used where the speaker expresses a wish/want for the hearer to carry out an action immediately or in the future. In Jose Mourinho's case, directives were not only used explicitly to demand clearer, more elaborated answers from the interviewer, they were also used implicitly by the Portuguese manager to influence the interviewer into not asking anymore questions regarding controversial refereeing decisions. Such indirect request, according to Searle (1969), comes from the speaker's effort to produce a certain illocutionary effect on the hearer to perform tasks that the speaker wishes to be carried out.

In performing a successful implicit illocutionary act, the speaker's intention that a certain action is performed must first be recognized and understood by the hearer. In Jose Mourinho's case, utterances such as "*it's better that we finish here*" and "*I don't want to describe*" highlights his attempt to get the interviewer to understand his wish to not question him further regarding decisions made by the referees. Justova (2006) pointed out that for the hearer to recognize the speaker's intention, he must be, first of all, be acquainted with the context which the utterance is spoken. In Jose Mourinho's case, both utterances show his attempt to influence the journalist to understand his concern of being misquoted and fined by the English Football Association (FA) by saying "*I don't want to be punished*".

The findings also revealed three noticeable phenomena in the way Jose Mourinho managed his illocutionary acts in his post-match interviews. Firstly, representative utterances can be seen dominating other illocutionary utterances with a total percentage of 95.9% recorded in matches won by Chelsea, and a total percentage

of 73.2% recorded in matches of which Chelsea were defeated or drawn. Such dominance is mainly due to the main purpose of post-match interviews. The practice of being interviewed after matches was made mandatory and effective from season 2010/2011 for coaching staff after matches and failure to obey to such implementation would result in breaching of this rule. Post-match interviews in the context of professional football, such as the BPL, serve as the platforms for coaching staff to evaluate the performance of their team and the opposition, the decisions of their substitutions, the opposition coaches, the referees and so on. In Jose Mourinho's case, due to the journalists' questions mostly intended to find out his opinions on a bit of everything in the matches played before the post-match interviews, most of his illocutionary acts in his post-match interviews were therefore representative. With all of his representative utterances appear to be assessable in terms of their truthfulness, with a word-to-world direction of fit where they were used to fit into the reality of the matches, as well as showing his psychological state of expressing beliefs, the dominance of representative utterances in all the matches regardless of the match results is understandable.

The second phenomenon revealed by the findings of Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts is the zero appearance of declarations in his post-match interviews. As shown in the data analysis, none of Jose Mourinho's utterances had the effect to "bring about the correspondence between the propositional content and reality", as described by Searle (1977) of declarations in his illocutionary act classification system. In other words, none of Jose Mourinho's utterances had the effect of changing the status of the referred objects, nor alternate the reality of the world. It is the purpose of post-match interviews, where coaching staff are interviewed for their opinions about the matches that limits the use of declarations. For the Portuguese manager, declarations with a purpose to alternate or change the order of the world have a higher probability of

occurring when, for example, his authority is exercised to bring changes to his squad using his words, as he is, described by Austin (1962), the "correct" person as the first team head coach of Chelsea Football Club.

The third phenomenon observed in Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary act is the zero appearance of directive illocutionary acts in post-match interviews in matches that were won. As mentioned above, the difference in Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts in matches with win and defeat/draw lies in the Portuguese manager's use of directives in some of the matches Chelsea did not manage to win due to controversial refereeing decisions. In those matches, directives were used to implicitly stopping the interviewer to ask further questions about penalties or red cards. The zero appearance of directives in the matches that were won explains that there was no need express the speaker's wish to have the hearer carrying out certain task, such as to not ask questions about controversial refereeing decisions.

Apart from looking to examine Jose Mourinho's pattern of using illocutionary acts in his post-match interviews, this research also aims to reveal the influences of adversarial questioning on Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts. The findings have revealed that assertiveness was adopted by the journalists' in all the post-match interviews regardless of the match results (55.6% for matches won and 36.6% for matches ended with Chelsea defeated/drawn). In other words, the findings suggest that journalists did not adhere to journalistic neutrality and preferred to express their opinions, as well as using suggestive questions prompting certain responses from Jose Mourinho when questioning him most of the times. The zero appearance of questioning strategies such as directness, opposition and persistence in post-match interviews of the winning matches suggested a less hostile interviewing compared to the way Jose Mourinho was questioned when Chelsea failed to win.

To answer the second research question on influences of adversarial questioning on Jose Mourinho's use of Illocutionary Act, the researcher also devised a table breaking down the frequency of Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts when responding to each questioning dimension in all the matches divided into two match results: win and defeat/draw. Three phenomena were observed and the first noticeable phenomenon is the difference in the "non-representative" illocutionary acts used by Jose Mourinho. More non-representative utterances were delivered in defeat/draw matches suggests that when matches were won, the interviewers' objectives were to "obtain", rather than "pursue". This was reflected in the number of times tag questions were used at the end of a question. In matches with defeat/draw outcome, only three times tag questions were used compared to a total of eight tag questions used when matches were won.

Also known as negative interrogations, tag questions are also considered as "vehicles of assertion" or "limiting devices" in interview practices (Heritage, 2002) used to limit interviewees' answering options into yes/no only. In the case of matches that were won, interviewers often expressed their own opinions which contributed to Chelsea's victory over their opponents and tried to prompt Jose Mourinho into agreeing with them. Another reason of the overly domination of representatives in matches Chelsea won is the unneeded avoidance of hostile questions by Jose Mourinho, which is observed as the second phenomenon in the influence of adversarial questioning on the Portuguese manager.

The hostility of the interviewers was more obviously demonstrated in matches with defeat/draw outcome, thus inviting counter-measures from Mourinho to avoid answering such questions, which also explains the use of directive illocutionary acts especially in matches with a defeat/draw outcome. The findings have revealed that Chelsea's inability to secure victory over their opponents often invited Jose Mourinho to

use directives in his answers to respond to the interviewers' questions by (i) Suggesting the interviewer to be stopped at once, (ii) Indirectly influencing the interviewers to stop asking similar questions, and (iii) Signaling his intention to leave the interview after telling the interviewer to review some of the controversial moments.

The use of these directive illocutionary acts were mostly due to the influences from the interviewers' relentless pursuing of Mourinho's answers the topics such as some of the referees' controversial decisions or the campaigning of referees and managers against Chelsea. An example of directive illocutionary act is when Jose Mourinho attempted to suggest the interview to be finished at once after being persuaded by the interviewer to comment on some the controversial incidents. After delivering an indirect request, the interviewer could either ask another question or show his eagerness to pursue for Jose Mourinho's answer by suggesting that there will be no punishments imposed on him if he described what happened in the match. At this stage, it was up to Jose Mourinho to accepting the journalist's proposed action, or as pointed out by Jauni (2013), resisting the journalist's "proposed type of response". With interviewers persisting with hostile manner in getting Jose Mourinho to respond with certain answers in matches ended with defeat/draw outcome, it often invited the Portuguese manager to avoid answering the questions using directive illocutionary acts, such as suggesting stopping the interview or replying with a question to the journalist instead of responding with an answer.

The third observed phenomenon in the influence of journalists' questioning on Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts is the extent of directness shown by the journalists, as interview questions with indirectness strategies were mostly asked (six times) in matches with defeat/draw outcome compared to matches that were won, where such questions were only asked once. In his study of neutrality in political interviews,

Raijmaeker (2012) claimed that interviewers tend to apply politeness strategies such as self-referencing question frames or other-referencing question frames to protect their "neutralistic stance". Such politeness strategies are often used to preserve the face loss of their interviewees by asking about their willingness to comment on a certain issue, such as "*Would you agree that…*" or to reduce the forcefulness of the interview questions with a self-referencing frame by prefacing the questions with prefaces such as "so *I just wonder*" or "I realized that".

The previous chapter has shown that indirect questions, though formulated by interviewers to avoid potential face loss of their interviewees as Huls and Varwijk's (2010) pointed out, did not always invite positive responses or cooperation. In other words, Mourinho's uncooperative behavior towards interviewers' indirect questions came from his reluctance to answer questions which he considered "risky" regardless of how the questions were formulated.

5.3   Recommendations for Future Research

As mentioned in the previous section, being a study focused on using Jose Mourinho's illocutionary acts to form a basic understanding on how illocutionary acts are used in the in post-match interviews in the context of English professional football, this study is unable to represent the whole community of all managers coaching in England. To allow more convincing generalization in terms of the use of illocutionary acts of the coaching staff in whole of the United Kingdom, the scope of research needs to be broadened by researchers who conduct similar studies from including more coaching staff from different football leagues in the United Kingdom, such as the Division One and the Championship League. The study could also be modified into a cultural comparative study by comparing the way illocutionary acts are used by

managers in other football leagues, such as La Liga (Spain), Seria A (Italy) and Ligue One (France).

To solve the limitation of studying Jose Mourinho's use of illocutionary acts within the mentioned time frame only, researchers who wish to study on post-match interviews of football matches in the future must plan their studies ahead of time to solve the problem of accessibility of media reference to ensure their research data are obtained before they are removed from the internet. For this, data such as recordings of post-match interviews that are broadcast live should be considered. For researchers who lack fluency in other languages and still wish to study post-match interviews in those languages, one possible countermeasure for this limitation is to obtain a reliable translation services for the research to be conducted. Another alternative for this would be changing the research data. In other words, instead of studying the post-match interviews, researchers could look into published news written by journalists, which also contain excerpts of managers' post-match interviews.

REFERENCES

Al-Duleimi, A. D. D., & Hammoodi, W. R. (2015). A Pragmatic Study of Strategic Maneuvering in Selected Political Interviews. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, *5*, 79-99. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2015.51008

Alfahad, A. (2014). Aggressiveness and Deference in Arabic Broadcast Interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics, 88,* 58-72. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/03782166/88

Altikriti, S. F. (2011). Speech Act Analysis to Short Stories. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *2*(6), 1374-1384. doi:10.4304/jltr.2.6.1374-1384

Alvarez, E. L. (2005). Performative Speech Act Verbs in Present Day English. *Interlinguistica, 16*(2), 685-702. Retrieved from https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/3697086.pdf

Anscombe, E. (1959). *Intention*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Atkinson, P., Coffey, A.,& Delamont, S. (2001). A Debate about Our Canon. *Qualitative Research, 1*(1), 5-21.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. (Urmson F.O. et al, 2nd ed.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from https://www.ling.upenn.edu/~rnoyer/courses/103/Austin.pdf

Bach, K. (1994). Meaning, Speech Acts and Communication. *Basic Topics in the Philosophy of Language* (Harnish, R. M.*,* Ed.). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf. Retrieved from http://online.sfsu.edu/kbach/oldies/MSAC.pdf

Barclay, P. (2005). *Mourinho: Further Anatomy of a Winner*. London: The Orion Publishing Group Ltd.

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC). (2014, February 14). Arsene Wenger is a 'specialist in failure' - Jose Mourinho. *BBC Sports Online News*. Retrieved December 4, 2017, from http://www.bbc.com/sport/football/26188451

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC). (2014, January 29). Jose Mourinho: Chelsea boss says West Ham's style is '19th Century'. *BBC Sports Online News*. Retrieved December 4, 2017, from http://www.bbc.com/sport/football/25956108

Bergh, G. (2011). Football is war: A case study of minute-by-minute football commentary. *PPG LINGUISTICA/UF JF, 2*, 83-93. Retrieved from http://www.ufjf.br/revistaveredas/files/2011/05/artigo-72.pdf

Björgvinsson, L. Á. (2011). *Speech Act Theory: A Critical Overview*. The University of Island. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/1464600/Speech_Act_Theory - _A_Critical_Overview?auto=download

Buchwalow, I. B., & Böcker, W. (2010). *Immunohistochemistry: basics and methods.* Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Bull, P. (1994). On identifying questions, replies and non-replies in political interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 13*, 115-131. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0261927X94132002

Caldwell, D. (2009). Working Your Words: Appraisal in the AFL Post-match Interview. *Australian Review of applied Linguistics, 32*(2), 13.1-13.17. doi: 10.2104/aral0913

Chow, V. F., Ad-Darraji, H. H. A., Ismail, S. A. M. M., & Abdullah, S. A. (2012). Offering as a Commissive and Directive Speech Act: Consequence for Cross Cultural Communication. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publication, 2*(3). Retrieved from http://www.ijsrp.org/research_paper_mar2012 /ijsrp-Mar-2012-89.pdf

Clayman, S. E. (2001). Answer and Evasions. *Language in Society. Volume 30*, 403-442. Los Angeles: CA: University of California. Retrieved from http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/clayman/docs/AnswersandEvasions.pdf

Clayman, S. E. (2004). Arenas of Interaction in the Mediated Public Sphere. *Poetics, 32*(1), 29-49. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2003.12.003

Clayman, S. E. (2010). Address terms in the Service of Other actions: the Case of News Interview Talk. *Discourse & Communication, 4*(2), 161-183. doi: 10.1177/1750481310364330

Clayman, S. E., Elliott, M. N, Heritage, J., & McDonald, L. L. (2006). When does the Watchdog Bark? Condition of Aggressive Questioning in Presidential News Conferences. *American Sociological Review, 72*, 23-41. Retrieved from http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/clayman/docs/Watchdog Barks.pdf

Clayman, S., & Heritage, J. (2002). *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air* (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511613623

Clayman, S. E., & Heritage, J. (2002). Questioning Presidents: Journalistic Deferences and Adverseness in the Press Conferences of U.S Presidents Eisenhower and Reagan. *Journal of Communication*, December 2002, 749-775. Retrieved from http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/clayman/Site/Publications_files/Clayman %20and%20Heritage%202002%20Questioning%20Presidents.pdf

Clayman, S. E., & Heritage, J. (2013). The Changing Tenor of Questioning Over Time: Tracking a Question Form across US Presidential News Conference, 1953-2000. *Journalism Practice, 2013,* 7(4), 481-501. Retrieved from http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/heritage/Site/Publications_files/NegForm %20History.pdf

Culpeper, J., & Semino, E. (2000). Constructing Witches and Spells: Speech Acts and Activity Types in Early Modern England. J*ournal of Historical Pragmatics, 1(*1), 97-116. Retrieved from http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/staff/eiaes/Speech%20 acts-witchcraft.pdf

Eveland Jr, W. P., & Shah, D. V.(2003). The Impact of Individual and Interpersonal Factors on Perceived News Media Bias. *Political Psychology, 24*(1), 101-117. Retrieved from https://www.journalism.wisc.edu/~dshah/PP2003.pdf

File, K. A. (2012). *Post-match Interviews in New Zealand Rugby: A Conciliatory Media Interview Genre*. NZEJ, 26(1), 1-22.

Fifield, D. (2015, September 15). José Mourinho tells journalists: 'Google instead of asking stupid questions'. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from: https://www.theguardian.com/football/2015/sep/15/chelsea-jose-mourinho-google-stupid-questions

Greatbatch, D. (1986). Aspects of topical organisation in news interviews: the use of agenda shifting procedures by interviewees. *Media, Culture and Society, 8*, 441-455.

Greatbatch, D. (1998). A Turn-taking System for British News Interviews. *Language in Society, 13*(3), 401-430.

Guardian Sport (2015, April 30). Nigel Pearson's rant in full: Leicester manager's "ostrich" outburst. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/football/2015/apr/30/nigel-pearson-rant-full-leicester

Harris, S. (1991). Evasive Action: How Politician Respond in Political Interviews. in Scannel. P (ed), *Broadcast Talk*, London, U.K.: Sage Publications

Heritage, J. (2002). The Limits of Questioning: Negative Interrogatives and Hostile Question Content. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*, 1427-1446. Retrieved from http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/heritage/Site/Publications_files/LIMITS_OF_QUESTIONING.pdf

Huls, E., & Varwijk, J. (2010). Political Bias in TV Interviews. *Discourse and Society, 22*(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1177/0957926510382836

Humpolik, R. (2014). *Language of Football Commentators: An Analysis of Live English Football Commentary and its Types*. (Bachelor Thesis, Masaryk University in Brno, Czech Republic). Retrieved from https://is.muni.cz/th/383176/ff_b/Bachelor_s_thesis.pdf

Jackson, O. (2013, February 11). *Jose Mourinho - Still the Special One?* [Online Blog] Retrieved from: http://www.thefootballhistoryboys.com/2013/02/jose-mourinho-still-special-one.html

Jauni, H. (2013). *Answering Adversarial Questions and Negotiating Epistemic Stances in Political Interviews*. Paper presented at the American Sociology Association Annual Meeting Conference, New York, N.Y. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265913987_Answering_Adversarial_Questions_and_Negotiating_Epistemic_Stances_in_Political_Interviews

Justová, V. (2006). *Direct and Indirect Speech Acts in English*. (Dissertation, Masaryk University in Brno, Czech Republic). Retrieved from https://is.muni.cz/th/109677/ff_b/bachelor_thesis.pdf

Kampf, Z. (2009). Public (non-) apologies: The discourse of minimizing responsibility. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*(11), 2257-2270.

Kantara, A. (2012), Adversarial Challenges and Responses in Greek Political Interviews: A Case Study. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines*, 5(2), 171-189. Retrieved from http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/journals/cadaad/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Volume-5_Kantara.pdf

Kernell, S. (1986), *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*. (2nd Ed.), Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly. Retrieved from http://www.uvm.edu/~dguber/POLS293/articles/kernell.pdf

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*, London: Longman. Retrieved from https://www.scribd.com/doc/242418276/Principles-of-pragmatics-Leech-pdf

Lewandowski, M. (2008). The Language of Soccer – a Sociolect or a Register? P. Nowak, P. Nowakowski (Eds.) Language, Communication, Information, 3, 21-32.

Macaulay, M. (1996). Asking to Ask: The Strategic Function of Indirect Requests for Information in Interviews. *Pragmatics,* 6(4), 491-509. Retrieved from

http://journals.linguisticsociety.org/elanguage/pragmatics/article/download/423/423-717-1-PB.pdf

Macaulay, M. (2001). Tough talk: Indirectness and gender in requests for information. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *33*(2), 293-316.

Mancini, P., & Hallin, D. (1984). Speaking of the President: Political Structure and Representational Form in U.S and Italian Television news. *Theory and Society, 13*, 829-850.

Masaki, Y. (2004). Critique of J. L. Austin's Speech Act Theory: Decentralization of the Speaker Centered Meaning in Communication. *Kyushu Communication Studies, 2*, 27-43. Retrieved from http://www.caj1971.com/~kyushu/KCS_02_Yoshitake.pdf

Milin-Ashmore, J. (2015, December 14). Jose Mourinho and the problem of siege mentality. *These Football Times.* Retrieve from: https://thesefootballtimes.co/2015/12/14/jose-mourinho-and-the-problem-of-siege-mentality/

PA Sport. (2014, December 29). *Mourinho Mind Games Are a Tactic to Invoke Siege Mentality Among Chelsea Players.* [Online blog]. Retrieved from: http://worldsoccertalk.com/2014/12/29/mourinho-mind-games-are-a-tactic-to-invoke-siege-mentality-among-chelsea-players/

Platts, M. (1979). *Ways of Meaning*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Piirainen-Marsh, A. (2005). Managing adversarial questioning in broadcast interviews. *Journal of Politeness Research. 1*(2), 193-217.

Oishi, E. (2006). Austin's Speech Act Theory and the Speech Situation. *Esersizi Filosofici,1*, 1-14. Retrieved from https://www2.units.it/eserfilo/art106/oishi106.pdf

Rácová, A., & Horecký, J. (2006). The Theory of Illocutionary Acts as a Basis for the Description of the Syntax of Slovak Carpathian Romany. *Skase Journal of Theoretical Linguistics, 3*(1)*,* 212-24. Retrieved from http://www.skase.sk/ Volumes/JTL05/2.pdf

Raijmaeker, K. (2012). *Neutrality in Political Interviews: Establishing a Link between the Interactional Practices and Underlying Motivations for Achieving Interviewer Neutrality Using a CA Framework.* Gent, Belgium: Universiteit Gent. Retrieved from http://lib.ugent.be/fulltxt/RUG01/002/060/406/RUG01-002060406_2013_0001_AC.pdf

Rendle-Short, J. (2007). Neutralism and adversarial challenges in the political news interview. *Discourse and Communication, 1*(4), 387-406.

Robinson, J. P. (1976). Interpersonal Influence in Election Campaigns: Two step-flow Hypotheses. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 40,* 304-319. https://doi.org/10.1086 /268307

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1971). *The Philosophy of Language*. London, England: Oxford University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society, 5*(1), 1-23. Retrieved from https://sites.duke.edu/conversions/files/2014 /09/Searle_Illocutionary-Acts.pdf

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). " Narrative Analysis" Thirty Years Later. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1-4), 97-106. doi: 10.1075/jnlh.7.11nar

Schmidt, E., Tirok, M., & Bösch, M. (2012). *Journalism: The Basic of Print, Online and Broadcast Reporting.* Berlin, Germany: Media in Cooperation & Transition (MICT). Retrieved from http://dam.mict-international.org/ftp/shortcuts /shortcuts_en_online.pdf

Schudson, M. (1982). The Politics of Narrative Form: The Emergence of News Conventions in Print and Television. *Daedalus, 111*, 97-113.

Schudson, M. (1995). *The Power of News*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Siebel, M. (2002). *What is an Illocutionary Point?* Speech Acts, Mind, and Social Reality. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy, Volume 79, pp. 125-139. Retrieved from https://www.uni-oldenburg.de/fileadmin/user_upload/philosophie/download/Mitarbeiter/Siebel/Siebel_What_is_an_Illocutionary_Point.pdf

Siebel, M. (2003). William P. Alston: Illocutionary Acts and Sentence Meaning. *Grazer Philosophische Studien, 62*, 247-259. Retrieved from https://www.uni-oldenburg.de/fileadmin/user_upload/philosophie/personen/mark.siebel/download/Siebel_Review_Alston.pdf

Sky Sports. (2013, October 1). Jose Mourinho angered by questions over Chelsea forward Kevin De Bruyne. *Sky Sports.* Retrieved from: http://www.skysports.com/football/news/11668/8950418/jose-mourinho-angered-by-questions-over-chelsea-forward-kevin-de-bruyne

Smith, C. (1990). *Presidential Press Conferences: A Critical Approach*. New York: Praeger.

Smith, P. W. H. (1991). *Speech Act Theory, Discourse Structure and Indirect Speech Acts*. (Doctoral Disseration, The University of Leeds). Retrieved from http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/734/1/uk_bl_ethos_438318.pdf

Sun, T. T. (2005). *Questioning Chinese Ministers: Questioning and Answering Patterns in Chinese Official Press Conferences*. (Master's Thesis, The Chinese University of Hong Kong). Retrieved from http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/lin/new/doc/ma_papers/malin/Sun%20Tingting_2004-05.pdf

Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and Speech Acts: Volume 1, Principles of Language Use*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Virbel, J., & Chemla, K. (2015). *Texts, Textual Acts and the History of Science*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing AG.

Wu, F., Cheng, Y. and Chao, D. (2017). *Global questioners: examining journalists' aggressiveness at Chinese premiers' press conferences (1993 – 2015)*. Asian Journal of Communication, 27(4), 357-377.

Yip, P. (2003). *A Study of the Anti Face Threatening Strategies of Interviewers in Adversarial Radio news Interviews in Hong Kong*. Unpublished MA research project, Department of Linguistics and Modern Languages, Chinese University of Hong Kong.