A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF FACE MANAGEMENT IN SELECTED ENGLISH TELEVION INTERVIEWS

تحليل تداولي لأدارة الوجه في مجموعة مختارة من المقابلات التلفزيونية

Instructor **Rauf Kareem Mahmood**

PhD in English Language and Linguistics

Assistant Instructor **Naz Jamal Muhammad**

MA in English Language and Linguistics

المدرس **رؤوف كريم محمود**

دكتوراه في اللغة الأنكليزية واللسانيات

rkpenjweni@yahoo.com

ناز جمال محمد

ماجستير في اللغة الأنكليزية و اللسانيات

nazhardi06@yahoo.com

الخلاصة

إن إدارة الوجه عملية جوهرية اثناء تبادل الحديث بين المتحدثين. حين يبدأ مقدم البرنامج بالتحدث الى ضيف البرنامج و يتبادولون الحديث فيما بينهم، يحاول كل واحد منهم الحفاظ على وجهه، و لكن من غير جدوى في بعض الأحيان. يفترض هذا البحث بأن ادارة الوجه بين المتحدث و المتحدث اليه اثناء المقابلات التلفزيونية تعتمد على تفعيل المعرفة التداولية، كما يفترض بأن تهديد الوجه تفوق الحفاظ عليه اثناء المقابلات التلفزيونية. يقتصر البحث على تحقيق لأدارة الوجه بين المتحدث و المتحدث اليه حينما يتبادلون الحديث فيما بينهم من منطلق تبادلي. يتناول البحث مجموعة من المقابلات باللغة الأنكليزية لبعض القنوات البريطانية، كما تم استعمال بعض المفاهيم و المباديء الأساسية معتمدا على مباديء أدب الكلام عند Leech (١٩٨٣)، و مقدمة Brown & Levinson (١٩٨٧) حول الوجه الأيجابي و الوجه السلبي، و عملية تهديد الوجه و ستراتيجيات تقليل التهديدات على الوجه. إن البحث ذو قيمة علمية نظرية لمن لديه رغبة في دراسة ادارة الوجه اثناء تبادل الحديث بين الناس بشكل عام، وبين المتحدث و المتحدث اليه والتفاعل الأجتماعي بينهما اثناء المقابلات التلفزيونية على شكل خاص.

مفتاح الكلمات: ادارة الوجه، عملية تهديد الوجه، المقابلات التلفزيونية، الوجه السلبي و الوجه الأيجابي

1. Introduction:

Face management is crucial during speech exchanged between the participants. When the interviewer and the interviewee start communicating and turns are transmitted between them, each tries hard to protect his/her own face from being threatened, but this social value

is not always protected as it is often threatened on purpose. This paper hypothesizes that the ability to manage face by the interviewer and the interviewee is affected by activating pragmatic knowledge. It also postulates that face threatening act dominates face saving act in TV interviews.

The paper is limited to the investigation of face management between the interviewer and the interviewee while they exchange turns from a pragmatic perspective focusing on British English. It is specified to the study of selected English interviews from local British Channels, and uses certain concepts depending on Leech's politeness principles (1983), Brown and Levinson's (1987) introduction to positive and negative face, and face threatening acts with the strategies for reducing them.

The paper is of theoretical value for those who like to study face management during turn transitions between people generally, and the interviewer and the interviewee in particular while they interact socially on TV.

Keywords: Face Management, FTA, TV Interview, Negative Face and Positive Face.

2. Realization of speech acts and TV interviews

When people interact and communicate, be it a daily conversation, a formal one, an interview, etc., they try to find meaning. Taguchi (2012) states, in a conversation and turn by turn, the interlocutors go through meaning, action and context. During a TV interview, both the interviewer and the interviewee try to negotiate and find meaning in the context. These are done through the levels of speech acts: locution, illocution and perlocution, and types of speech acts: explicit and implicit. Having the capability of using speech acts, as Grace (2009) states, language users, including interviewers, use language for different purposes, and fully fulfill the function of language in a communicative activity. In a communicative activity, the interviewer should take aspects of speech situation into consideration. Such aspects are proposed by Leech (1983) as follows:

1. Addressers or addressees: "addressers" is the other term used to refer to speakers or writers, whereas "addressees" refers to hearers or readers.
2. The context of an utterance: context is any background knowledge assumed to be shared by speaker and hearer, and which contributes to hearer's interpretation of what speaker means by a given utterance.
3. The goal(s) of an utterance: the goal of an utterance is to talk about the intended meaning of the utterance, or speaker's intention in uttering it. The term goal, as Krisnawati (2011) states, is more neutral than intention because it does not commit its user to dealing with motivation, but can be used generally of goal-oriented activities.
4. The utterance as a form of act or activity: a speech act
5. The utterance as a product of a verbal act.

Consider part of an interview by Paxman interviewing Michael Howard, the former UK Home Secretary:

(1) Paxman: Mr. Haward , have you ever lied in any public statements?
Howard: Certainly not. I gave a very full account of the dismissal of Derek Louis to
The House of Commons Selected Committee. It was a decision and was necessary for me to take.
Paxman: Is there anything you wish to change about the statement to the House of
Commons or any public statement you made about this matter?
Howard: No, nothing.
Paxman: What do you think of this statement you did? "I, as the leader of the opposition, ask Louis to suspend the Government Packer, Mr. Marriad
immediately and when Louis objected, I threatened to instruct him to do it"
Howard: I was entitled to ….
Paxman : Did you threaten to overrule him?
Howard: I discussed this matter with David Louis, I gave him my opinion in a strong
language, but I didn't instruct him, I wasn't entitled to instruct him, I was
entitled to give him my opinion.
Paxman: With respect, you did not answer my question.
Howard: It is dealing with a relevant point whether I was entitled to do it or not. I
dealt with...
Paxman: (*interrupting*) But with respect, you did not answer my question whether you
overruled him.
Howard: But the question is about whether I was entitled to do it or not and I did not
do that.

(*Newsnight*, BBC Two, 2007. YouTube)

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uwlsd8RAoqI

Interview (1) shows that Paxman is the addresser, the interviewer, and the speaker, while Howard is the addressee, the interviewee and the hearer.

As a journalist, Paxman tries to make Howard confess that he threatened Louis, overruled him and dismissed him in the Party by force as he did not obey; this is Paxman's sole goal. On the other hand, Howard tries to show that he is not a liar, he plays with words, and he utters expressions which are not related to Paxman's question for the sake of achieving his goal that he is a democratic man who respects others' views. Moreover, when Howard talks about his decision of dismissing Louis, he performs the act of dismissal. When Paxman says, "What do you think of this statement you did?..." he is not asking an ordinary question, he is trying to oblige Howard to confess that he is a liar and a dictator, although he is the leader of the Conservative Party. Thus, such utterance can be considered as a product of a verbal act. It is worth mentioning that according to Leech's aspect of speech, Paxman is the addresser and Howard is the addressee, but as an interviewer, Paxman is not only the speaker, but also the hearer.

It is striking that when people talk and communicate with each other, they utter different utterances, among them, some do not have any intentions and they are uttered spontaneously. In other words, not every utterance has intentions as Leech states in his aspect of speech. On the other hand, it is not always the case for every utterance to be resulted from a verbal act, since there might be utterances that are spoken by people without being a product of a verbal act. For instance, mentally disordered people may utter utterances that are neither a product of a verbal act nor a result of genuine intentions.

3. Prominent acts in TV interviews

In a TV interview, both the interviewer and the interviewee perform most of the acts like, announcement, accusation, promising, congratulation, request, asking, compliment, complaint, promise, command, etc. Some are prominent and frequent as follows:

3.1. Accusation

One of the acts used during a TV interview is the act of accusing. Such act can be performed by both the interviewee and the interviewer. Consider the following interview by Paxman; he interviews Tony Blair, the UK ex- Prime Minister:

(2) Paxman: Is it your religion conviction which makes you be tolerant of the idea of faith school?

Blair: No, I think there is a strong case for faith schools, (*pause*) ah… parents often wish their children been brought up with faith. We had faith schools for years whether in a Muslim community, Christian or Jewish.

Paxman: Would it be happy if it had been taught that the world was created in six days?

Blair: well, I ….

Paxman: (*interrupting*) Is it appropriate to teach creation at an early stage at schools?

Blair: I don't believe that it does in the way you are suggesting. It depends on the parents. If they want their children to grow up with beliefs and religion, it is OK. If not, it is their choice.

Paxman: My question is: is it appropriate that the creation being taught at schools?

Blair: I am not sure that it is, it is a hypothetic question. (*pause*) people want to colonize God and religion for political positions; I make no claim for that at all.

(*Newsnight*, BBC Two, 2006. YouTube)

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BX6iCnRtTsA

Paxman considers Blair a religious man who supports faith schools and wants children being brought up with religious beliefs. In other words, Paxman asks the same question four times through the use of different linguistic expressions like: "Is it appropriate that the creation being taught at schools", "Would it be happy if it had been taught…", "Is it appropriate to teach creation at an early stage at schools", etc. to perform the act of accusing him that his religious beliefs make him support faith schools, and this might be for the sake of political affairs. When Paxman performs that act, he threatens Blair's face as he imposes on him and gives him no choice. On the other hand, such accusation might result in the interviewee's face saving when Paxman says, "Is it your religion conviction which makes

you be tolerant of the idea of faith school?" since school of faith is something good and such idea becomes better when it is supported by a person from a high position.

Most of the acts of accusation in TV interviews lead to face threatening as whenever the speaker accuses the hearer of something, the hearer's face is threatened whether or not the strategies of face saving act is followed. It should also be realized that sometimes accusation might lead to face saving.

3.2. Announcement

The act of announcing is another one which is performed during a TV interview. Austin (1962, cited in Thomas 1995) states, his felicity condition for some actions that cannot be performed randomly. The act of announcement or declaration should be performed depending on certain conditions like: time, place, people, and the procedure. It is striking that not everyone can perform the act of announcement anywhere and anytime. Paxman interviews the president of Iceland, Olafur Rangnar Grimsson. Consider a part of it:

(3) Paxman: Mr. President, this is a deal of good faith by government, who do you direct?

Grimsson: I have not directed at all. There were a lot of misleading statements in your introduction. It is very important to realize that the law we signed in September based on the agreement we had made with Britain and the Netherlands and the only thing that I have decided is to allow the Icelandic people to have a final say in the referendum with our fundamental democratic principles…

Paxman: (*interrupting*) And the consequences of your decision have already been that the Icelandic States credit awareness are reduced to the level of some

jungle bombs entity to the empirically IMF loans and to empirically lost of your leadership of your European Union. Are all these good things?

Grimsson: Oh, no, no, that is too far. We are a democratic country and we will have a recovery after this collapse….

Paxman: (*interrupting*) Mr. President, many people are drown from this and the lesson is, "Don't trust Iceland".

Grimsson: Well, you have to trust the democratic principle. In many European countries, there is a referendum of democratic process, I know in Britain you don't have an experience in trusting in referendum, even British Parliament is completely different from us, and we depend on referendum of democratic principle.

Paxman: (*laughing*) let me ask you a very simple question: Will British and Dutch get their money?

Grimsson: Well, as I said from the beginning, according to the assignment Iceland declares that every political party argues that Iceland should obey the obligation. And in my declaration two days ago, I declared that the constructive solution of Iceland debate was a precondition of the economic recovery in Iceland and also good relationship with all nations.

(*Newsnight*, BBC Two, 2010)

Interview (3) is made after the banking collapse of Iceland for which Grimsson is its president. He decided to give his population a vote on whether to compensate the UK and Dutch government. Such behaviour might cripple Iceland. In this interview, Paxman declares that Grimsson deceives his nation and other European countries by uttering "And the consequences of your decision have already been that the Iceland States are reduced to the level of some jungle bombs entity….are these good things?" and "Don't trust Iceland". Paxman announces that Iceland does not give

back British and Dutch's money by using such utterances. In other words, Paxman tries to convey a message and declare that Iceland is on debt and cannot pay back the money. It is worth mentioning that Paxman as an interviewer can perform the act of announcement as he is a broadcaster on BBC Two which is a suitable place for declaring at a suitable time as he cannot perform such an act at any time. By performing that act, the interviewer threatens Grimsson's face on one hand and all Iceland on the other hand. Furthermore, Grimsson also performs an act, he announces that he leads a democratic country, he follows democratic principles and Britain is not as democratic as Iceland. The interviewee also damages the interviewer's face and the face of the third party which is Britain. It is worth mentioning that during the act announcement in TV interviews, not all the faces are threatened.

3.3. Request

The act of request has a strong connection with indirectness and politeness. People often perform this act indirectly to look polite and avoid face threatening. Such an act, as Salih (2012a) states, needs some tricks to be performed like playing with linguistic expressions so as to avoid embarrassment. Both Mey (2001) and Thomas (1995) argue that performing it needs preparation; the speaker should pave the way gradually through certain utterances so as to make his/her request. Request is another act which is preformed during a TV interview. Moreover, both the interviewer and the interviewee can perform it during the interview. The following is part of an interview by Ross; he interviews Emma Watson, an actress, the star of Harry Porter and a teenager:

(4) Ross: As I know you love the books of Harry Porter, and you know a lot about them.

Watson: I know what you want to do, oh…. Ahhh.

Ross: You should know a lot about Harry Porter. I would like to test your knowledge through this quiz itch just to see how much you can remember.

Watson: (*laughing*) OK.

(*The Jonathan Ross Show*, ITV1, 2012)

Interview (4) shows that Ross paves the ground so as to make his request which is asking Watson to answer his questions. Such questions are

not ordinary ones that are asked during interviews, they are questions to ensure Ross and people whether she read the books on Harry porter as she is one of the stars of this movie. Thus, he performs the act of requesting indirectly and step by step; first, he gives an introduction that Watson is into the books of Harry Porter, then, he starts praising her that she has a lot of information on them, after that, he repeats his prediction and later, he makes his request. It is worth mentioning that Ross paves the way to his request so as to prevent his face threatening as Watson might be rude and she might damage his face. On the other hand, such a request imposes on Watson and might reduce her choice, and her face might be threatened.

Similarly, in interview (1), Paxman performs the act of request by telling Haward to answer his question. He makes his request indirectly by saying, "With respect, you did not answer my question." Then, he repeats his request and says, "But with respect, you did not answer my question whether you overruled him". Paxman could say, "Answer my question", but he does not want his utterance to lead to face threatening.

However, not all the acts of request are performed indirectly during the interview. The nature of the programme, the participants, and the topic affect such act, for example, Kyle makes use of the reality that the show is his and he has power over his interviewee, so he usually performs the act of request directly. Consider a part of an interview made by him in which he invites a boy who claims that his girlfriend kicked him out, got a new boyfriend and then regretted:

(5) Kyle: You say that she wants to get you back.
Boyfriend: Yes, she sends me messages every day after kicking me out.
(Back the stage the new boyfriend shouts: he is lying, he sends messages,
we…..)
Kyle: (*interrupting*) What is that?! (*pause*) shut up, shut up.
(*To the ex-boyfriend*) What does she say to you?
Boyfriend: She wants me back.
(back the stage the new boyfriend shouts: you send her photos)
Kyle: (*leaving the stage and going to the back stage*) Shut up, I can't do this

unless you shut up, sit, wait for your turn and be quite. Thank you very much indeed.

(*The Jeremy Kyle Show*, ITV 1, 2013)

In interview (5), Kyle directly performs the act of request by saying, "Shut up, shut up", "Shut up, I can't do this unless you shut up, sit, wait for your turn and be quite". It is obvious that Kyle does not care whether a face is threatened or not. Moreover, he exploits the situation as the stage is his, he has the right to do this since the third speaker interrupts his interview, and he might try to create a real situation as the nature of his show requires. It is striking that the interviewees also make their requests during an interview. They either perform them directly or indirectly.

3.4. Questioning

During speech exchange, the participants ask one another about different things; they might ask about each other's condition, favourite colour, children, idea, etc. with the use of utterances like: "How are you?", "What do you think of…?", "Do you like it?", "How often do you see your parents a week", "What is your favourite food?" , etc. These questions are not only performed for gaining information, but they are also asked for the sake of embarrassment.

The act of questioning is a frequent act which is used during a TV interview. The interviewer asks the interviewee different questions so as to gain information as Baker (2010) states that one of the goals of an interview is collecting information. It is striking that sometimes the interviewer performs such an act so as to embarrass the interviewee or even the third party. Consider a part of an interview which is made by Paxman. He interviews Zainab Bangura, the UN Special Representative of Sexual Violence:

(6) Paxman: Do you think this sexual violence is growing?

Bangura: The more intense the conflict becomes, the more you have the incidence of sexual violence.

Paxman: Do you have any indication of why that is.

Bangura: Our guess is that, it has to do with the dynamic conflicts as most of the conflicts in the South of Africa, you have Bosnia and Colombia, are within

the country. When they start fighting, what they do, they go against the opposition, against women and children on the other side. Children are raped from six months to eleven years!

Paxman: These are babies! Simply I cannot understand why a man behaves like this. It is almost incomprehensible. You know the GA is going to discuss this the next day. Is there any chance of achieving anything?

Bangura: I have talked to the president of the Congo about this matter and….

(*Newsnight*, BBC Two, 2013)

Interview (6) displays that Paxman asks three questions. The questions show that he performs the act of questioning to gain some information, for instance, he asks his first question in order to know Bangura's idea about the growth of sexual violence, then he performs another act of questioning by asking her idea about the purpose behind raping, later, he asks her whether or not there is any chance of doing something so as to stop such violence. While performing these three acts no face is threatened and Paxman gets the information he needs. However, the following is another interview by Paxman, he interviews Sting, a singer and a rainforest campaigner. Consider a part of it:

(7) Paxman: Your are trying to stop the source of renewable energy, aren't you?

Sting: I agree, I think energy is needed, but at the same time we need environment for energy to work in and the agreements against the dams haven't been heard and the Indians themselves are severely affected by this dam, but they aren't being listened to.

Paxman: So, what is environmentally friendly? To look after the Indians or to enjoy some renewable energy?

Sting: Well, it is an interesting point. I think we need energy, but it needs to be balanced with the existence of the environment, without the environment

there is no economics, so in fifty years time, there is gonna be no resource.

Paxman: The Brazilian Government is making a progress in developing a renewable energy, he is also making some progress in saving the rainforest.

Sting: Of course it is, but this dam is one dam, a serious dam which costs 70 billion and takes about 80,000 workers to make. This will not be economic without another six behind it which is severely compromised, an area, rainforest; I worked for it very hard in the past twenty years to protect.

Paxman: Now the Brazilian Government wants the help of other developed countries like us, USA and so on to stop the rainforest to be gone up. Do you support that?

Sting: I agree.

Paxman: How much tax do you think it should take to go up?

Sting: (*laughing*) this is not my issue; this is an economic question and needs an expert to answer. I think we should support Brazil in saving the resources.

(*Newsnight*, BBC Two, 2013)

In interview (7), Paxman asks four questions; one of them is tag question and the rest are WH questions. It is obvious that none of the questions are asked for the sake of getting information, they are for other purposes like embarrassment and face threatening, for instance, he produces the utterance "Aren't you?" so as to make Sting confess that he is against renewable resources. In other words, Paxman is sure about the truth that Sting is against the renewable resources, but he wants to make him confess in front of the audience. Then, Paxman tries to emphasize on the same idea that Sting does not support the renewable resources by asking the second question, "So, what is environmentally friendly? To look after the Indians or to enjoy some renewable energy?". Similarly, the third question is performed by Paxman for the same reason. Later, he asks Sting to tell him the amount of money that is taken by tax to make the rainforest go up. Such question completely damages Sting's face as Paxman imposes

on him and reduces his options since Sting has knowledge of the amount of money and the number of the workers that the dam needs.

It should be realized that within the two types of the act of questioning in TV interviews, the first is to get information which might be dealt with as neutral since no face is damaged or saved whereas most of the second is asked for the sake of embarrassments and face damaging and some are performed to protect face.

4. The overlap of acts in TV interviews

When the interviewee and the interviewer start interacting during TV interviews and different acts are performed, some acts might overlap. Sometimes the act of questioning and request are mixed and the audiences wonder whether the participants ask questions or make request. Furthermore, questioning and announcement are often difficult to be separated; congratulating and compliment are sometimes overlapped, etc. The first utterance in interview (1), "Mr. Haward, have you ever lied in any public statement?" shows that Paxman performs the act of questioning and at the same times it may be considered as the act of announcement or accusation as Paxman is quite sure that his interviewee is a liar. Such overlap might result from certain strategies that the speaker tries to perform to avoid threatening Haward's face. Similarly, in interview 4, Paxman performs the act of questioning again by saying "What do you think of a person who is a prominent figure in the party and does not know the day of the election?!" such act is performed and it might be taken as the act of announcement or the act of accusation as Paxman tries to show although Griff is a prominent figure in his party, he is careless and does not know the elections day. Paxman damages Griff's face by asking such question. On the other hand, Paxman accuses Griff, he declares and tells his audience that Griff is not such a responsible person to depend on.

5. Levels of speech acts and TV interviews

Doerge (2004) talks about Austin's presenting a doctrine of three different acts which are supposed to be involved when someone issues words: The first is the act of saying something, which Austin provides the technical notion of a "locutionary act". The second is what Doerge has introduced as the AUSTIN-act as he thinks that Austin has not given it any name is now called an "illocutionary act". The third is a further kind of action which is typically performed when words are issued, which Austin calls the "perlocutionary act". Thomas (1995, p. 49) defines these three levels of speech acts as:

Locution: the actual words uttered.
Illocution: the force or the intention behind the words.
Perlocution: the effect of the illocution on the hearer.

Furthermore, Leech (1983, p.199) says, "The locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts are, in fact, three basic components with a help of which a speech act is

performed". He argues that locution is performing an act of saying something; illocution is performing an act in something while perlocution is performing an act by saying something. When an utterance is uttered and an action is performed, an utterance is produced which consists of three related acts: the first is the actual linguistic expressions, the second has a relation with the mind of the speaker and the third has a relation with the mind of the hearer.

It is worth mentioning that when an action is performed during TV interviews, the three levels can be noticed and realized by both the interviewer and the interviewee since interviews lead to the interaction of the participants. Consider the following interview by Paxman who interviews Felix Baumgartner, the astronaut that jumped off from his ship to the earth in 2012.

(8) Paxman: Felix Baumgartner, why did you want to do this?
Baumgartner: Well, I used to be a very comparative person, I was sixteen years and I wanted to push out the limits. I was working on this so hard.
Paxman: Sure, but this is not like competing tennis, or like pool or running, it is easy. To put yourself on the edge of space miles and miles up, that is completely different.
Baumgartner: It is, but this makes you so unique and challenging because if you look at my background, there is no challenge left because I have done all the highest building in the world and I felt kind of lost. I have learnt everything from scratch, I am not a properly trained astronaut, so I started everything from zero and that was a challenge.
Paxman: What is it like when you were up there all alone, looking down on the earth from that height, what is it like?
Baumgartner: Well, I was standing outside, it was a very calm quite moment, peaceful totally and unique, but at the same time you realize that everything around you is hostile and I could not stand there for a long time as the oxygen on my back could hold only for ten minutes and I had to go off

as fast as I could.

Paxman: As you say you could have had this view from just pictures, but you felt somehow you wanted to see yourself.

Baumgartner: It is nothing in comparing of what I saw and I think I am the only person in the world who had this image in the mind.

Paxman: What do you want to do next then?!

Baumgartner: Well, breaking the speed light!

Paxman: Oh, I would love to see that very much.

(*Newsnight*, BBC Two, 2012)

In his interview with Baumgartner, Paxman wants to tell him that he has done something different and challenging when he says, "To put yourself on the edge of space miles and miles up, that is completely different." but Baumgartner wants to implicate that what is different and unique is not his jump, but not being a proper astronaut is different and unique:

Locution: I am not a properly trained astronaut.
Possible illocution: He is not a real or ordinary astronaut and he could do his challenge.
Possible perlocution: Paxman was not interested in Baumgartner's intention, so he asks another question which has nothing to do with the case whether the challenge is the jump or the background.

It is striking that Paxman's perlocution becomes locution as Baumgartner's utterance has a different impact, so he says:

Locution: What is it like when you were up there all alone, looking down on the earth from that height, what is it like?
Possible illocution: He wants to show that the jump is more important than the background.
Possible perlocution: Baumgartner describes the situation easily until he reaches the expression, "but at the same time you realize that everything around you is hostile…" such utterance becomes locution which shows another implicature whether he wanted to jump because of the surrounding that was hostile and frightening or because of the oxygen which could hold for a short time.

Similarly, Paxman performs the act of questioning which has also three related acts like:
Locution: As you say you could have had this view from just pictures, but you felt somehow you wanted to see yourself.
Possible illocution: Paxman wants tell him that pictures do not always tell the truth.
Possible perlocution: The real picture is what is in Baumgartner's mind.

The last act which is performed by Paxman is the act of questioning so that he can get some information about Baumgartner's future programme. When Baumgartner answers, he wants to make an implicature as follows:

Locution: Well, breaking the speed light!

Possible illocution: He wants to show that he is going to do something better than his jumping off or he really wants to do that.

Possible perlocution: Paxman is interested in what Baumgartner is going to do by saying that he loves to see it very much. Showing such interest could be considered as a positive politeness which is oriented towards the positive face of the hearer.

During performing the four acts by Paxman and Baumgartner, no miscommunication takes place except the first act in which Paxman concentrates on the significance of the jump from miles and miles whereas Baumgartner focuses on his background that although he is not a real astronaut he can jump off from space to the earth. Similarly, Paxman interviews Phil Bentley, The British Gas Chairman. Consider a part of it:

(9) Paxman: Why do you think people have lost trust in you?

Bentley: Well, I think they definitely have. I think one of the issue is the number of the tariff gas, there are 544 tariff to chose from a lot of people looking at the energy bill. They don't understand whether to save money.

Paxman: Why you developed so many tariffs in your industry and why decided suddenly? You won't play fair with the consumer.

Bentley: We are trying to simplify the tariffs.

Paxman: Would you apologize to them for what happens to their bills. When you see the whole sale price is going down and the bills are not going down.

Bentley: Jeremy our margins are 5% a year…

Paxman: (interrupting) Your bills are going up and the whole sale is going down!

Bentley: We need to make a transpiring, giving customers bills and simplifying tariffs and I …

Paxman: (*interrupting*) What is an acceptable profit for your company?

Bentley: As I said 5% is right for the investment we have to make.

Paxman: When it has been up to 9% that has been wrong, hasn't it?

Bentley: When it has been very cold this year, I can tell.

Paxman: So, you weren't responsible for the cold, were you?

Bentley: No, but we clearly sell more energy.
Paxman: You took the margin this year, didn't you?
Bentley: Well, we got fix cost; we pass on the benefit of our customer.
Paxman: But you took 9% and you say 5% is acceptable.
Bentley: Well, it…
Paxman: (*interrupting*) You can't control the weather!
Bentley: We can't control the gas price.

(*Newsnight*, BBC Two, 2011)

In interview (9), Paxman performs the first act indirectly by accusing Bentley and his company of cheating people. Such indirect accusation is made as the face is negative and Paxman does not want to damage his face and Bentley directly, so he follows one of the strategies of face saving act. The three related acts are as follows:
Locution: Why do you think people have lost trust in you?
Possible illocution: Bentley is a cheater.
Possible perlocution: Bentley does not become angry.

Moreover, the second act is the act of request which is performed indirectly by Paxman. He neither wants to impose on Bentley nor threatens his own face by making such request, so he follows one of the strategies that lead to FSA as making such request directly threatens face of both interlocuters:
Locution: Would you apologize for them for what happens to their bills?
Possible illocution: The bills are going up and the whole price is going down, so the chairman should apologize for letting people down and making them pay a lot of money.
Possible perlocution: Bentley is not ready to apologize.

It is worth mentioning that both the interviewer and the interviewee are not reading from the same page and this leads to the miscommunication.

The third act is another accusation which is performed by Paxman like:
Locution: What is an acceptable profit for your company?
Possible illocution: Paxman does not ask so as to get information, but his intention is to damage Bentley's face that his acceptable profit is not 5%.
Possible perlocution: He tries to mislead Paxman by saying that the right profit is 5%.

It is striking that the interviewee's perlocution becomes locution and leaves an impact on the interviewer as follows:
Locution: As I said 5% is right for the investment we have to make.
Possible illocution: 5% is right as the company's margin, but this is not fixed.
Possible perlocution: Paxman's face is threatened.

The last act is the act of declaration which is made by Paxman that Bentley cheats and exploits the cold weather so as to take a lot of money from people, the three levels of this act are as follows:

Locution: You can't control the weather.

Possible illocution: Paxman apparently implies that Bentley makes use of the weather.

Possible perlocution: Such an act threatens Bentley's face.

The last act shows that the interviewee changes the interviewer's force in a way that people do not guarantee the price of gas and it is not fixed while the interviewer tries to imply that those who are responsible for the gas bills deceive people and try to make the gas bills go up depending on the weather, such implicature damages Bentley's face and the third party as well. Furthermore, Bentley plays with the tariffs in order to mislead people and make them do not understand.

While Paxman and Bentley interact and five acts are performed, each one wants to construct meaning according to his interests. All paxman's intention is changed by Bentley as he can control the conversation and the meaning is made as Bentley wishes so that he can hide the truth.

Similarly, Ross invites an adventurer Bear Grylls who has been into the wild many times. The following is a part of the interview:

(10) Ross: Ladies and gentlemen, let us welcome Bear Grylls. I love watching him what
he does, whether he squeezes an elephant, cuts the zebras' head off or even
hydrating his body like this (*showing a video*).
Grylls: Hi everyone.
Ross: I love being with you in the wild, but people asked me when I came back, "this
is what he eased on you".
Grylls: Listen, many people just call me and ask me to join me, they just want to know
whether I guarantee they would survive with me and I say, no.
Ross: (*laughing*) what is your next book then?
Grylls: A Survive Guide for Life. It is important to know how to achieve your goals,
and how to keep going.
Ross: Now teach us how you get survived in the wild. Here are some cockroaches, worms, berries, etc. to try. Let's have them.

(*The Jonathan Ross Show*, ITV1, 2012)

Interview (10) shows that Ross performs FSA or strategies like showing his interviewee his interests in his work like, "I love watching him what he does, whether he squeezes an elephant…" it is obvious that doing what Grylls does is unusual, but Ross orients positive politeness towards what Grylls holds dear with exaggeration. The levels of the act of compliment could be as follows:
Locution: I love being with you in the wild, but people asked me when I came back, "this is what he eased on you".
Possible illocutuion: Beside the act of compliment, Ross wishes to imply that Grylls might ease on him so as not to die in the wild, in doing this he tells Grylls indirectly through what people think.
Possible perlocution: Grylls changes Ross's force by saying that he never eases on people even the famous ones, he says, "Listen, many people just call me and ask me to join me, they just want to know whether I guarantee they would survive with me and I say, no."

The second act which Ross performs is the act of questioning so as to get information and to show how interested he is in Grylls's work:
Locution: What is your next book then?
Possible illocution: Ross's force is to show his interest to Grylls's work.
Possible perlocution: A Survive Guide for Life. Grylls wishes to tell Ross and people how to gain their goals and how to keep going. He wants to show them how life is beautiful and people should never give up. Furthermore, Grylls understands Ross's intention, so he talks about his work more and more so that he can influence on him more than before.

It is striking that Ross might not be really interested in what Grylls does, but he pretends in order to perform FSA. It is obvious that whenever the speaker shows his care to what the hearer does as Brown and Levinson (1987) state, is to reduce the amount of the threat over the hearer's positive face because such face might be damaged when the speaker disapproves what the hearer holds dear.

In the end, Ross tries to involve both himself and Grylls in the action of eating insects which is a way of reducing the threat on him. In other words, when Grylls goes to the wild and tries hard to survive, he searches

for food which is only cockroaches, worms, and so on. To tell people apparently that Grylls is an insect eater might be the act of threatening his face that is why Ross involves himself in the act so as to follow FSA. Kyle, however, interviews a father who does not accept his daughter even if the DNA test proves it, consider a part of it:

(11) Kyle: You are 41 and the headline says that "I will never accept your teenage daughter even if you prove she is mine". As you said in the introduction, "I had one night stayed, but not for sure". Let's go back and talk about it.
Father: Well, at a night club, she was drunk, I was drunk…
Kyle: (*interrupting*) Nice! It wasn't romantically, you say, "I was drunk and high"!
Father: Yeah, correct.
Kyle: What happened when she said she was pregnant?
Father: It was a long time ago; I was drunk quite a lot.
Kyle: You say that you don't want to do a DNA test!
Father: Now, I have a family.
Kyle: So, you ignore her!
Father: Basically yes.
Kyle: You are here just to be sure that she is yours.
Father: Yeah.
Kyle: Why haven't you done this before? You are still drunk and high?!
Father: I….
Kyle: (*interrupting*) I am sure you are.

(*The Jeremy Kyle Show*, ITV 1, 2013)

Interview (11) shows that Kyle performs the act of charging the father with being careless and not a responsible person of what he has done before as he does not want to accept his teenage daughter even if the DNA test proves it. It is obvious that such act insults the father and leads to his embarrassment and face threatening:

Locution: You are 41 and the headline says that "I will never accept your teenage daughter even if you prove she is mine".

Possible illocution: Kyle tries to insult him as he is 41 and still is not a responsible person of his deeds.

Possible perlocutuion: The father insists and claims that such act is just a mistake. Although he is 41, he is not ready to accept his daughter officially.

His act leads to miscommunication between the interviewer and the interviewee.

It is obvious that Kyle does not follow any strategies so as to reduce face threatening act and he overtly damages the father's face by uttering expressions like: "Nice! It wasn't romantically, you say, "I was drunk and high", Why haven't you done this before? You are still drunk and high?! I am sure you are".

6. Explicit and implicit speech acts in TV interviews

Thomas (1995) argues, explicit performative is a mechanism which allows the speaker to remove any possibility of misunderstanding the force of an utterance. She compares the utterance "We remind you that all library books are due to be returned by 9th June" to "All library books are due to be returned by 9th June", in both utterances the same action is performed in which the borrowers are reminded to return their books by the due date, as Austin (cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 47) states, "there are no substantial distinctions in meaning between explicit and implicit performatives". Moreover, she explains that some formal or ritual situations require an explicit one whereas some situations do require an implicit one.

Similarly, Salih (2012a) answers the question, "Why do people have two kinds of speech acts?" that there are some acts which cannot be performed explicitly and vice versa. Furthermore, he states that certain acts by nature should be clear, they should be explicit to make people know about it while others like request, for example should be implicit for the sake of saving face and politeness, for instance, the speaker might ask a rude person to open a window, he/she should ask indirectly so as to guarantee that his/her face would not be damaged by saying "It is hot in here." and the hearer might look rude to answer, " So what?", in such case, the speaker can cancel his/her implicature as, " I am just telling you that the weather is very hot today."

Explicit and implicit speech act or performing an act directly or indirectly depends on the situation, people, time and place, not every act could be performed by everyone in every place at every time explicitly.

When an interviewer interviews someone, he/she tries to make sure how to use the utterances depending on the nature of the programme, the interviewee, the situation, etc. Moreover, the interviewer might practice his/her power over the interviewee as he/she has the stage, the programme, people, camera, guards, etc, but such power cannot be exploited in the end of the show or in the street. On the other hand, the interviewee might have the power which he/she cannot practice during the interview and so on.

It is worth mentioning that performing any acts is affected by factors like power, social distance and size of imposition.

7. Other influential factors

There are other factors that influentially affect face which do not tend to be pragmatic, but rather sociolinguistics.

7.1 Social distance and power

Power and social distance can be considered as factors which affect face management. Such factors have also influence on explicit and implicit speech act. It is obvious that a person who has a power over others, can be very direct, and can perform explicit speech act freely like a commander in military service, parents over their children, a teacher over his/her students, etc. On the contrary, officers, children, students try hard to be completely indirect and whenever they need to ask their parents , teachers, or commanders something, they perform implicit speech act so as to be polite, and save their own face. On the other hand, friends, sisters and colleagues can perform explicit speech act as they have the same social distance.

It is worth mentioning that whether such reality could be applied to interviews or not, the interviewer should take into a consideration who his/her interlocutor is, what social rank he/she has, and which kind of personality he/she has. The same is true for the interviewee. Interview (4) shows that Ross paves the ground for making his request which is asking Watson to answer his questions, he performs the act of requesting implicitly for fear of her rudeness and she might damage his face although he has power over her as the show is his, and he is older than her.

Paxman tries to tell Blair in interview (2) that he is a religious man; he supports faith schools. He wants to perform the act of accusing him that his religious beliefs make him support faith schools and this might be for the sake of political affairs. In doing this, Paxman does not perform such act explicitly and this is not because Tony Blair is a prime minister and has power over him, but because he is such a respectable and respectful person that Paxman cannot accuse him directly. On the other hand, Blair performs the act of declaration, but implicitly, that he is with faith schools and he does not want to exploit his political position to fulfill his personal beliefs. Moreover, he thinks that his performance of that declaration act should be implicit although it is declaring as he cannot announce on TV as a prime minister that he supports faith schools because this might not have good consequences.

However, in interview (1), Paxman asks the leader of the Conservative Party and says, "Mr. Haward , have you ever lied in any public statement?", such question is not an ordinary question, he wants to make use of his utterance as a verbal act so as to perform the act of accusing Haward of being a dictator as he denies overruling Louis when he discovered that he had not obeyed him. Interview (3) shows that Paxman performs the act of accusing Grimsson, explicitly, of deceiving his nation and other European countries by uttering "And the consequences of your decision are that the Iceland states is reduced to the level of some jungle bombs entity….are these good things?", "Don't trust Iceland". Furthermore, Grimsson announces that he leads a democratic country, he follows democratic principles and Britain is not as democratic as Iceland.

It is worth mentioning that power and social distance in TV interviews might not be like those in everyday life as according to the explanations a person like Paxman who is only a programme presenter and an interviewer, performs the act of accusing people belonging to high social rank like ministers, presidents, leaders of political parties, etc. He interviews them showing he is more powerful. Since the show is his, he makes use of this chance to consider himself more powerful than them. The same is true with Ross, Kyle and Norton. Furthermore, such interviewers

do not pay that attention to the social rank of their interviewee if it is compared to their deeds, personalities and esteems.

7.2 Size of imposition

During a TV interview, the interviewer depends on the size of imposition so that he/she can perform an act explicitly or implicitly. Most of the impositions involve the act of request, if the size of the request is great; the interviewer performs the act implicitly. In addition, imposing is also culture-specific. In interview (11), Kyle explicitly performs the act of charging the father although the degree of the imposition is great by saying, "You are 41 and the headline says that 'I will never accept your teenage daughter even if you prove she is mine' " as a person who is 41 is grown up enough to accept the truth that he/she has made a mistake. Moreover, Kyle explicitly imposes on him and tries to show how careless he is by uttering "So, you ignore her", "Why haven't you done this before?..." and " I am sure you are"

Based on the explanations, one might discover that during TV interviews, explicit and implicit speech acts are not completely influenced by social distance, power and size of imposition if they are compared to personality, esteem and deeds of both the interviewee and the interviewer.

8. Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from this study:

1. Face is managed when both the interviewer and the interviewee have the subconscious ability to manage pragmatic and sociolinguistic parameters side by side with managing linguistic expressions.
2. TV interviews have certain peculiarities which are different from ordinary communications; transition relevance places, turn construction unit, adjacency pairs and turns are violated deliberately which might be for damaging a face or saving it. On the other hand, the interviewers are all highly qualified people, and recognizing the turn completion is quite easy, they only violate to achieve their purposes.
3. The first type of questioning which is performed to get information is neutral during TV interviews since no face is damaged or saved whereas most of the second is asked for the sake of embarrassments and face damaging and some are performed to protect face.

4. Power and social distance in TV interviews might not be like those in everyday life as the interviewers do not pay enough attention to the social rank of their interviewee if it is compared to their deeds, personalities and esteems and vice versa. Moreover, most of the interviewers make use of their power over their interviewees as the stage and the programme are theirs.
5. During TV interviews, performing face threatening acts is more than performing face protecting acts; FTA dominates FSA.

REFERENCES

Baker, P. (2010) "How to Present for TV, Radio, and Business". [Online]. Available at: http:/www.presenterskills.co.uk [Accessed on 21 April 2013].

Brown, P. and Levinson, C. (1987) *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davis, W. A. (1998) *Implicature: Intention: Convention, and Principle in the Failure of Gricean Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doerge, F. (2004) "Illocutionary Acts- Austine's Account and What Searle Made out of it". Dissertation. University of Tuebingen.

Fraser, B. (2010) *Pragmatic Competence: The Case of Heading.* Kaltenbock, G. , Mihatch,W. , Schneider, S. eds. [Online]. Available at: http://www.bu.edu/sed/files/2010/10/2010 . [Accessed on 17 May. 2013].

Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-face Behaviour*. Chicago: Congress Catalog.

Grace, K. (2009) "The Development of Pragmatic Competence in The Speech Act of Compliments Responses by Chinese Learners of English during The First Semester of Studying Abroad". Thesis. University of Southern California.

Grice, H. (1957) "Meaning". *The Philosophical Review*, 66 (3), 377-388. [Online]. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2182440. [Accessed on 12 July 2013].

Krisnawati, E. (2011) "*Pragmatic Competence in The spoken English Classroom". Conaplin Journal- Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1 (1), 105-115.

Leech, G. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Press.
Mey, J. (2001) *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. (2nd edition). Oxford: Blackwell.

Mirzaei, A. et al. eds. (2012) "Exploring Pragmalinguistics and Sociopragmatic Variability in Speech Act Production in L2 Learners and Native Speakers". *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 68 (4), 79-102.

Salih, S. (2012a) *Speech Acts and Discourse Analysis*. Lecture. University of Sulaimany, English Department, Oct. 2012.

Smith, J. (2009) "The Acquisition of Pragmatic Competence: Compliment Response Strategies in Learners of Spanish". Dissertation. Graduate Faculty of Louisiana State University.

Susikaran, R. (2013) "Towards Developing Pragmatic Competence". *An International Journal in English-The Criterion*, 12, 1-7. [Online]. Available at: http:/ www.the criterion.com. [Accessed on 12 July 2013].

Taguchi, N., ed. (2009) *Pragmatic Competence.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Taguchi, N. (2011) "Rater Variation in the Assessment of Speech Acts". International Pragmatic Association, 21 (3), 453-471.[Online]. Available at: http://www. jtls. Shirazu.ac.ir. [Accessed on 21 June 2013].

Taguchi, N. (2012) *Contex, Individual Differences and Pragmatic Competence*. Bristol: Cogress Catalogue.

Thomas, J. (1995) *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction To Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Press.

Vitale, S. (2009) “Towards Pragmatic Competence in Communicative Teaching: The Question of Experience VS. Instruction in The L2 Classroom”. Thesis. Southern Louisiana University.

Zhao, Y and Paul, T. (2011) “Speech Act Theory and Its Application to EFL Teaching in China”. *The International Journal of – Language Society and Culture*, 32, 88-94. [Online] Available at: http:/ www. Educ.utds.edu. au/ users/tle/journal. [Accessed on 12 July 2013].