

Politeness Strategy

by Amin Amin

Submission date: 11-Feb-2022 10:45AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1759782841

File name: er_Politeness_trategies_in_the_US_Presidential_REVISI_9_FEB.docx (91.78K)

Word count: 4273

Character count: 23541

Shaping Political Image through Politeness Strategies in the Presidential Debates

35

Ahmad Amin Dalimunte

Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

amindalimunte@iainsu.ac.id

Fengwei Wen

Foreign Languages, Gannan Normal University, China

thomaswen@163.com

Abstract

Politeness involves evaluations and attitudes which are closely connected to the assessment of actions. Politeness investigations in presidential debates enables voters to assess the candidates' behavior to make well-informed decision during the election. The present study investigates politeness strategies in two different presidential debates within the United States electoral context: the Democratic party and the final presidential debates. Data were analyzed by adopting the coding scheme in Brown and Levinson's frameworks. The overall result indicates that both the presidential debates used more positive politeness strategies than the negative politeness. PPS-10 (*offer and promise*), PPS-12 (*include speaker and hearer in the activity*) and NPS-2 (*hedge*) were more frequently used in both types of debates. PPS-3 (*intensify interest to hearer*) was only frequent in the democratic debate, meanwhile PPS-3 (*give gifts to hearer*) was only frequent in the final presidential debate. The findings imply that the use of the politeness strategies can shape the candidates' positive political images in the presidential debates.

Keywords: positive politeness, negative politeness, presidential debates, face threatening act.

1. Introduction

Politeness is paramount in human interactions and plays an essential role in the way that we communicate with one another and define ourselves. Politeness covers all kinds of interpersonal behaviors in which our relationships are explored and maintained which is not only restricted to conventional aspects of linguistic etiquette. It is generally accepted that politeness deals with evaluation or attitudes. Evaluation and attitudes are closely connected to assessing the actions of persons, situation or event which is expected to produce ways of thinking and feeling about the persons, situations and events (attitude).

Political debate is a significant source of information about candidates because mostly it is the constituents' only opportunity to look at candidates interacting on

stage without campaign affairs (Siepmann, 1962). Furthermore, the discourse of the political debate is one of the richest wellsprings of campaign information for audiences. Jamieson (1987) suggested that political debates offer some benefits for viewers looking for information about candidates in the way that it enables audiences to disclose the candidates' communicative competence and habits of thinking, increase the accountability of candidates, check out the manipulative tendency of candidates. Political debates also provide an opportunity for the audiences to examine how the candidates respond to the challenges of the dispute. Viewing the performance, they can gather information about how the candidates will behave in office.

Given that political debate naturally involves conflicts between at least two parties or candidates, ~~there-it is a tendency-highly possible~~ that they are in face threatening situations. The common assumption is that ~~-The-face~~ threats are more likely to happen in competitive situations such as political debates rather than in any normal interactions (Fracchiolla, 2011). Strategically speaking, the candidates need to break down their rival's opposing views, ~~by-you#Through their~~ strong arguments and ~~to losinge your-their opposing partner'srivals' face,-in-order-that- they can draw~~ the audiences' ~~will pay big-attention,-to-This way, the candidatesyou-and-it will lead-you-to~~ can gain ~~their~~ support and ~~their-votes~~ from the viewers. Therefore, both parties are likely to save their faces and concurrently they strive to reach their goals, and ~~or-take some-a few benefits~~ at the expense of their rivals. ~~Therefore, it can be assumedIt seems~~ that the candidates ~~in the-political-debates-~~ tend to use as a few politeness strategies as possible ~~during the debates~~.

Hinck & Hinck (2002) argued that in political debates, ~~the-good ability~~ of the candidates ~~in-to~~ persuade people in order to view ~~his-or-her~~ their faces in ~~the-very~~ quite positive light can be a decisive factor of ~~his-or-her~~ their winning ~~victory~~ in the debates. Therefore, the present study draws ~~an importantassumes~~ assumption that the uses of politeness strategies in ~~a-certain-political debates~~ such as presidential debates might enable the constituents to assess the candidates' behaviors and ~~performances or attitudes~~ under ~~eertain-particular~~ circumstances in order to ~~draw get~~ a better picture of the candidates who will run for ~~the~~ office.

In ~~the~~ United States political ~~context~~stage, prior to the ~~final~~ presidential debate ~~as the final stages of the campaign,~~ the candidates are required to compete in their

own Party, for instance Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama in the Democratic Party. This stage is crucial, in order to determine their fitness for presidential candidacy. The researchers of the present study, therefore, regard that presidential this kind of debate in a political party like Democratic is quite different debate genre from the final one as the higher stake. Given the importance of revealing what sorts of politeness strategies can be used in such debates, Moreover, there is no particular effort in literature previous study which to further analyze focused on how certain particular candidates behaves during the debates in different debate stage considering since the circumstances, the face wants and face threats could be different from one to another. APA KATA PAST STUDIES? TUNJUKKAN GAP

Therefore, the present study will focus on the one comparative investigation of these two types kinds of debates which can might give an in-depth insight to readers, in who also can be particular debate viewers.

Therefore, the objectives of the present study are as follows:

1. To investigate investigate how candidates used of politeness strategies in the democratic and the presidential debates, and also t

2. To compare compare and contrast any politeness strategies used in the two different debates.

In line with the objectives, a few inquiries are put forward in this study. The research questions of the study are formulated as follows:

1. What kinds of politeness strategies do the presidential candidates use as when they participate in democratic political party and the final presidential debates?

2. What kinds of politeness strategies do the presidential candidates use when they participate in the final presidential debates?

16

Formatted: First line: 0 ch

38

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.42", Left 0 ch

34

3

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: List Paragraph, Left 0 ch, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.38" + Indent at: 0.63"

25

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

3

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: List Paragraph, Left 0 ch, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.38" + Indent at: 0.63"

3. 2- Are there any similarities and/or differences concerning of the politeness strategies used in the democratic and the final presidential two kinds of debates?

2. Literature review

2.1 Politeness theory

~~The concept of politeness has been long existed for a period of time which is in the literature since 1967 originated from pioneered Goffman's by Goffman through the (1967) notion of "face". According to him "face" is associated with the notions of social-emotional embarrassment or humiliation (Goffman, 1967). In Thus, in all many kinds of human interactions, a common there is a tendency is that face can be lost, maintained or enhanced. In general, when people are involved in interactions, they may tend to save each other's face, they do not only intend attempt to maintain their own face, but also try to save others' face. Because, to some extent, face can be is so vulnerable, no one in nature, everyone needs wants to lose it keep their face and their partners' face. In other words, no one wants to be in the situation of being embarrassed and humiliated.~~

³¹ Based on Goffman's (1967) construct of "face", Brown & Levinson (1987) advocated a more detailed concept of face. Face can be classified into both positive face and negative face. ³⁷ They defined positive face refers to as one's desire for the approval of others. ³⁷ On the other hand, while negative face refers to as one's desire that his or her activities be unimpeded. An act that violates either kind of face is considered as face-threatening act (FTA). Although we do not what to cause any FTA when we interact with each other, FTA is still unavoidable. Generally speaking, when an interlocutor causes an FTA, the interlocutor tends to use some strategies to mediate or minimize face damage in the process of FTA.

Brown & Levinson (1987) asserted that any act performed towards satisfying another's positive face refers to positive politeness, and towards satisfying one's negative face refers to negative politeness. Instead, positive politeness focuses on face saving acts concerning others' positive face. Meanwhile, negative ²⁸ politeness refers to maintaining the negative face of others. Thus, the strategic use of positive politeness

16

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

and negative politeness can be categorized into positive politeness strategies and negative politeness strategies, depending on the perspective of face that interlocutor wants to save. Following Brown and Levinson's concept of politeness, the present study explores the use of politeness strategies in presidential debates in American contexts.

2.2 Presidential debate

Debate refers to the process of inquiry and advocacy. It is a strategy of reaching a reasoned judgment on a proposition (Freeley & Steinberg, 2005). The use of debate to persuade people with reasoned arguments is not new. It has been long tradition used since the periods of Plato and Aristotle where it had been more was well-known as rhetoric (Brummet, 2018). Debate enables people to reach a decision in their own minds or to bring others around to their way of thinking. Since it Debate requires the audience and the opposing parties to be involved to compare and evaluate decisions and options that will be taken. In modern and scientific A societies, a few must have an effective methods and procedures to make a decision are arranged. One of them is debate. A free society should be arranged in such a way so as a lot of the decisions reached through debate. For instance, the court and the legislature are formed to utilize the debate as a means of decision making.

Freeley & Steinberg (2005) define presidential debate as a sort of debate which is highly distinctive from judicial and parliamentary debate because it is carried out under particular rules agreed upon by the debaters. This kind of debate is most commonly associated with political figures and their campaign. In the United States political arena, debates between the presidential candidates are well established. They were initially held in 1960 between Kennedy and Nixon. Presidential debate is regarded highly important in the presidential election because it serves as the focal point of the presidential campaign and is one of the determining factors to predict the winner of the presidential election.

2.3 Review of previous studies

11

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Despite that debates genre in electoral context has critical role to the process of generating well-informed decision making and votes particularly to the citizen voters and that how politeness strategies are used partly to reach the goals of the debates. According to the previous studies, a little research had been done by scholars in literature in this filed concerning the discussion of to explore further how politeness strategies are used in presidential debates. Hinck & Hinck (2002) analyzed the 1992 vice-presidential and presidential debates within using the Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. The results showed that candidates utilized different politeness strategies in both presidential and vice presidential debates. Fracchiolla (2011) examined the televised debate between Ségolène Royal and Nicolas Sarkozy. The results indicated that Nicolas Sarkozy made excessive displays of deferential politeness and used a wide range of registers while Ségolène Royal was more combative and formal. Based on Using Leech's politeness maxims, Pakzadian (2012) discussed politeness strategies used in the three 2008 presidential debates between McCain and Obama. The results showed that in analysis all showed that three debates Obama used more politeness maxims than compared to his counterpart McCain. Yasmeen, Jabeen and Akram (2014) examined politeness strategies used by Pakistani politicians during the session of Privileged Motives. Using by applying Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies to. The result results showed that bald on record strategy is found to be most frequently used to exhibit power and carefree style of communication. García (2014) explored politeness and politeness strategies in Spanish electoral debates in Spain. The result showed that both politeness and impoliteness strategies were genuine elements in debates.

The given review indicated that these scholars the past studies tended to adopted a more general concept of politeness strategies as their theoretical analysis frameworks and didn't go any further to rather than to analyze cover the more detailed subcategories of politeness strategies. Besides, most of the studies focused on the investigation of only one genre of presidential debates. They didn't make did not compare and any contrast or comparison to figure out similarities and differences between different the presidential debate genres. To fill the gap, the present study aims to investigate candidates' use of politeness strategies as well as similarities and

5

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold, Highlight

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold, Italic

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

differences concerning politeness strategies use in democratic and the final presidential debates.

3. Research method

Data sources consisted of two transcripts of the 2008 US presidential debates: democratic and final presidential debates. The first transcript was the final presidential debate between John McCain and Barack Obama in Hempstead, N.Y on October 15, 2008. The second transcript was democratic presidential debate between Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama in the National Constitution Center, Philadelphia on April 16, 2008. Transcripts of the two debates were downloaded from the website of The New York Times. **The first transcript consisted of 16,408 running words whereas the second one had 19,234 running words.**

To analyze the transcripts, a coding scheme was adopted from Brown and Levinson (1987) as analytical framework of the present study. The coding schema consisted of 15 positive politeness strategies and 10 negative politeness strategies. These politeness strategies are described in Table 1 along with their definitions. **Messages and chunks were analyzed and coded according to the selected coding scheme and framework of the analysis. In this step, the researchers attempted to figure out which of the 15 positive politeness strategies and 10 negative politeness strategies were used within the data. In order to achieve the analysis reliability, two coders who are the researchers of the present study analyzed and coded the entire transcripts separately without any collaboration before checking for the results of agreement.** When the two coders did not reach an agreement on particular analysis, the coders discussed it further and made a final decision regarding the analysis disputes. The coefficient of inter-coder reliability was .83 which indicated that the coding is reliable. Table 2 shows two examples of the coding.

Table 1. Codes for politeness strategies and the definitions

Positive Politeness Strategies (PPS)	Negative Politeness Strategies (NPS)
1. Notice and attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods). Showing that the S is attending to what the H has said or wants	1. Be conventionally indirect 2. Proposing indirectly on the reader by relying on Gricean principles that check for the "felicity" conditions of a request
2. Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H) Using exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodic	3. Hedge 4. Using words to indicate that the S is not assuming that the H will want to comply or agree with the S
3. Intensify interest to H 4. Using words that make one's own comment more	5. Be pessimistic 6. Saying that the S doubts that the conditions apply for even

<p>3. Interest by exaggerating or overstating facts</p> <p>4. Use in-group identity markers</p> <p>Using any of the innumerable ways to convey in-group membership: address forms, language or dialect, jargon</p> <p>1. Slang and ellipses</p> <p>5. Seek agreement</p> <p>Saying what the S believes the H will agree with by repeating or by seeking a safe topic</p> <p>6. Avoid disagreement</p> <p>Saying something so as to soften disagreement, or hedging one's opinion, or being vague so as to seem to agree</p> <p>1. Presuppose/raise/assert common ground</p> <p>Showing interest in the H by starting a message with small talk, greetings, or unrelated topics</p> <p>8. Joke</p> <p>Using humor to indicate shared connections with the H and putting H "at ease"</p> <p>9. Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants</p> <p>Using language to show that the S knows what the H wants and is willing to fit his/her wants or needs in with the H's</p> <p>10. Offer and promise</p> <p>Saying that the S will help the H obtain the H's wants</p> <p>11. Be optimistic</p> <p>Using optimistic words to show the S hopes that imposition on the H is not much</p> <p>12. Include both S and H in the activity</p> <p>Using first person plural pronouns to refer to S only or R only</p> <p>13. Give (or ask) reasons</p> <p>Giving/asking for reasons for an imposition on the reader</p> <p>14. Assume or assert reciprocity</p> <p>Showing the S has acted so as to now obligate the H</p> <p>15. Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)</p> <p>Giving praise and statements of appreciation and gratitude</p>	<p>1. Imposing on the H</p> <p>4. Minimize the imposition</p> <p>Using words to imply a lesser imposition on H than it seems</p> <p>5. Give deference</p> <p>Using words to abase the S, or to raise the H's status</p> <p>6. Apology</p> <p>Using words to indicate that the S is reluctant to impinge on the H</p> <p>7. Impersonalize S and H</p> <p>Requesting or imposing on H indirectly by using general words</p> <p>8. State the FAT as a general rule</p> <p>Referring to an underlying principle or document that regulates the H and S</p> <p>1. Nominalize</p> <p>Using a nominalized form to make the request or to state the imposition instead of using a verb</p> <p>1. Go on record as incurring a debt or as not indebted to the H</p> <p>Stating that the S will feel grateful for help that the H may in the future provide</p>
---	--

Table 2 Examples of the coding taken from the data

Presidential debates	Message	Politeness Strategy
Final	And the fact is, it's gotten pretty tough. And I regret some of the 12 active aspects of both campaigns (John McCain).	NPS-6
Democratic party	I will make it very clear that we will do so in a responsible and careful manner, because obviously, withdrawing troops and equipment is dangerous (Clinton Hillary).	PPS-10

4. Result and Discussion

Analyzing the debate transcripts using the adopted coding scheme in frameworks by Brown & Levinson (1987), results of the distributions of both

9 positive politeness and negative politeness strategies in the two different debates; namely, one final presidential debate and one democratic presidential debate, were presented in Table 3 and Table 4 respectively.

Table 3 Distribution of positive politeness strategies in the two debates

Positive politeness strategies	Final presidential debate		Democratic presidential debate	
	n	%	n	%
PPS-1 Notice and attend to H	0	0%	0	0%
PPS-2 Exaggerate	1	0.72%	6	4.26%
PPS-3 Intensify interest to H	2	1.45%	48	34.04%
PPS-4 Use in-group identity makers	4	2.90%	2	1.42%
PPS-5 Seek agreement	5	3.62%	3	2.13%
PPS-6 Avoid disagreement	0	0%	1	0.71%
PPS-7 Presuppose/raise/assert common ground	0	0%	0	0%
PPS-8 Joke	0	0%	0	0%
PPS-9 Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants	0	0%	0	0%
PPS-10 Offer and promise	26	18.84%	35	24.82%
PPS-11 Be optimistic	10	7.25%	8	5.67%
PPS-12 Include both S and H in the activity	52	37.68%	36	25.53%
PPS-13 Give (or ask) reasons	4	2.90%	0	0%
PPS-14 Assume or assert reciprocity	0	0%	0	0%
PPS-15 Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)	34	24.64%	2	1.42%
Total	138	100%	141	100%

10 Table 3 illustrates the distribution of positive politeness strategies in the two types of debates. The two debates share several positive politeness strategies: “exaggerate”, “intensify interest to hearer”, “use in-group identity markers”, “seek agreement”, “offer and promise”, “be optimistic”, “include speaker and hearer in the activity”, and “give gifts to hearer”. Nevertheless, two different strategies are little used; namely, “avoid disagreement” is only used in the democratic debate meanwhile “give (or ask) reason” is only found in the final one. In both debates, the strategies of “offer and promise” (PPS-10) and that of “include speaker and hearer in the activity” (PPS-12) are highly used. The strategy of “intensify interest to hearer” (PPS-3) is more often used in democratic debate compared to that in the presidential one whereas the presidential one used more PPS-12 than the democratic one did.

The presidential candidates in the Democratic debate frequently used the positive strategies of “intensify interest to hearer” (PPS-3). Concerning the gender difference, the female candidate in Democratic presidential debate tended to be more

cooperative than the male counterpart. Hillary confirmed that her ideas were suitable with Obama's ideas and American people's hopes. Both candidates were shaping a good political image that they were good partners for the candidacy from the Democratic Party.

The next positive politeness category which was commonly used in both debates is the strategy of "offer and promise". The analysis shows that all candidates regarded that "offer and promise" (PPS-10) was central important as it enabled them to stress and claim that the hearers' (opposing partner and public) wants were similar to the candidates' wants.

The strategy of "include speaker and hearer in the activity" (PPS-12) used in both democratic and final debate is to express that the candidates were highly close to the debate's viewers that American people and they were in the same boat. Excerpt 1 shows how Hillary used PPS-12 as response to Obama. The candidates attempted to claim that they were the representatives of American people in achieving the common goals.

6
Excerpt 1

You know, I am here, as is Senator Obama. Neither of us were included in those original documents. But in a very real sense, we demonstrate that that promise of America is alive and well. But it is at risk. (Hillary Clinton in Democratic debate)

The distribution percentage of "give gifts to hearer" (PPS-15) in the final debate was quite high meanwhile it is little found in its counterpart. It showed that candidates wanted to give their praises or statement of appreciations and gratitude to hearers in order to show that they were not mean and harsh. Instead, they respected and appreciated others and gave their positive comments. It helps to establish a positive, friendly, polite political image toward the American citizens.

Table 4 Distribution of negative politeness strategies in the two debates

Negative Politeness Strategies (NPS)	Final presidential debate		Democratic presidential debate	
	n	%	n	%
NPS-1 Be conventionally indirect	0	0%	0	0%
NPS-2 Hedge	24	61.54%	5	83.33%
NPS-3 Be pessimistic	0	0%	0	0%
NPS-4 Minimize the imposition	0	0%	0	0%
NPS-5 Give deference	9	23.08%	1	16.67%
NPS-6 Apologize	6	15.38%	0	0%

8

4

NPS-7	Impersonalize S and H	0	0%	0	0%
NPS-8	State the FTA as a general rule	0	0%	0	0%
NPS-9	Normalize	0	0%	0	0%
NPS-10	Go on record as incurring a debt or as not indebting the H	0	0%	0	0%
Total		39	100%	6	100%

Table 4 illustrates the distribution of the strategies of negative politeness in the two debates. The negative politeness strategies were little found in the data. Only a few strategies were chosen; namely, “hedge”, “give deference”, and “apologize”. Thus, there is no considerable difference between the final and democratic presidential debates in terms of using the negative strategies.

“Hedge” is the only most strategy in both debates. This current result is consistent with Wilamova (2005) who found that hedging devices were the dominant strategies of expressing negative politeness. In the data, hedges allowed candidates to minimize the imposition to their opposing partner and also soften the criticisms. The data expressed what Obama did when he criticized McCain’s past policy. This strategy was used in order to sound not rude. Simultaneously, both candidates wanted to be perceived as not harsh and had good behaviors as politicians. However, this result is contrast with Ardila’s (2019) investigation on rhetorical strategies used by one particular politician in Spanish contexts. He pointed out that impoliteness such as *creating an emotional atmosphere, the escalation of friction, snubbing* seemed to be several of preferred rhetorical strategies to threaten the face of his political opponents.

The findings conclude that negative politeness was less preferably used and has been less taken into account as proper rhetorical skills in the debates. Negative politeness is considered to have less substantial role in the political debates since the rules format as commonly agreed by the candidates determined who can speak under what circumstances and for how long imposed by a moderator in order to keep the candidates from any immediate interruptions (Dailey, Hinck and Hinck, 2008).

5. Conclusion

This study sets out to disclose the American presidential candidates’ use of politeness strategies and compare and contrast when the strategies are used in

different stakes of presidential debates. The results indicate that candidates in both debates adopted higher number of positive politeness strategies than the negative politeness strategies. PPS-10, PPS-12 and NPS-2 sequentially are more frequently used in both debates. PPS-3 is only frequently used in the democratic debate, meanwhile PPS-15 is only frequent in the final debate. The analysis shows that the selected strategies shaped their positive political images in the presidential debates. Having these positive images are considered to be critical importance of determining the winning of the election. However, several limitations of the present study need to be acknowledged in order to give insights to future direction. First, the data sources were restricted to two presidential debates. Future research might need to increase their data size to be more representative and generalizable. Second, there is no inclusion of non-verbal language into the analysis. Non-verbal aspects such as body movements and facial expressions can be further investigated to reveal the aspects of politeness by the candidates. Third, little attention was given to gender difference on the use of politeness strategies. Therefore, future research can discuss further gender difference in the presidential debates across political parties and cultures.

This study might yield some pedagogical implications to ESL classrooms. First, information of the politeness strategies might be important inputs while designing speaking skill materials concerning linguistic and rhetoric strategies ESL learners. Second, having knowledge of politeness strategies can facilitate English learners to achieve pragmatic competence and avoiding misunderstanding in cross-cultural communications. Third, teaching pragmatic knowledge enriched from the literature can facilitate learners to improve their rhetorical and argumentation skills while organizing ideas and noticing the alternatives that they can adopt to sound polite in order that they establish their claims and arguments to be more persuasive.

References

- Ardila, J. A. G. (2019). Impoliteness as a rhetorical strategy in Spain's politics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 140, 160–170.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.11.017>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge University Press.

- Brummet, B. S. (2018). *Rhetoric in Popular Culture*. In *SAGE Publications*.
- Edward A Hinck & Hinck, S. S. (2002). Politeness Strategies in the 1992 Vice Presidential and Presidential Debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 38, 234-250.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.2002.11821570>
- Fracchiolla, B. (2011). Politeness as a strategy of attack in a gendered political debate-The Royal-Sarkozy debate. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(10), 2480-2488.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.02.006>
- García, F. F. (2014). Impoliteness, pseudo-politeness, strategic politeness? On the nature of communicative behaviour in electoral debates. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 58, 60-89.
<http://www.ucm.es/info/circulo/no58/fernandez.pdf>
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual, Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Doubleday.
- Pakzadian, M. (2012). Politeness principle in 2008 presidential debates between Mc Cain and Obama. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 351-357.
<https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2012.v3n3p351>
- Steinberg, A. J. F. & D. L. (2005). *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making*. Wadsworth.
- Wilamova, S. (2005). On the Function of Hedging Devices in Negatively Polite Discourse. *BRNO Studies in English*, 31(1996), 85-93.

Politeness Strategy

ORIGINALITY REPORT

25%

SIMILARITY INDEX

21%

INTERNET SOURCES

16%

PUBLICATIONS

19%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	repositories.lib.utexas.edu Internet Source	8%
2	Submitted to Chester College of Higher Education Student Paper	2%
3	Diane L. Schallert, Yueh-hui Vanessa Chiang, Yangjoo Park, Michelle E. Jordan et al. "Being polite while fulfilling different discourse functions in online classroom discussions", Computers & Education, 2009 Publication	1%
4	Submitted to Universiti Teknologi MARA Student Paper	1%
5	regelwerk.grs.de Internet Source	1%
6	Submitted to University of Birmingham Student Paper	1%
7	ded.mo.gov Internet Source	1%

8	Submitted to Institute of Graduate Studies, UiTM Student Paper	1 %
9	positori.uin-alauddin.ac.id Internet Source	1 %
10	digilib.uinsby.ac.id Internet Source	1 %
11	www.semide.org Internet Source	1 %
12	temple-news.com Internet Source	1 %
13	Submitted to Georgetown University Student Paper	<1 %
14	Submitted to Higher Education Commission Pakistan Student Paper	<1 %
15	docshare.tips Internet Source	<1 %
16	www.gov.chilliwack.bc.ca Internet Source	<1 %
17	www.manaraa.com Internet Source	<1 %
18	Submitted to University of the Sunshine Coast Student Paper	<1 %

19	Submitted to Nottingham Trent University Student Paper	<1 %
20	temple.why.org Internet Source	<1 %
21	www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov Internet Source	<1 %
22	Edward A. Hinck, Shelly S. Hinck. "Politeness Strategies in the 1992 Vice Presidential and Presidential Debates", Argumentation and Advocacy, 2017 Publication	<1 %
23	Submitted to University of Lancaster Student Paper	<1 %
24	Submitted to University of Zurich Student Paper	<1 %
25	ccgovernment.carr.org Internet Source	<1 %
26	Schallert, D.L.. "Being polite while fulfilling different discourse functions in online classroom discussions", Computers & Education, 200911 Publication	<1 %
27	www.tandfonline.com Internet Source	<1 %
28	Submitted to University of Nottingham Student Paper	<1 %

<1 %

29

Submitted to Birkbeck College

Student Paper

<1 %

30

J.A.Garrido Ardila. "Impoliteness as a rhetorical strategy in Spain's politics", Journal of Pragmatics, 2019

Publication

<1 %

31

ebin.pub

Internet Source

<1 %

32

politics.bryanellis.com

Internet Source

<1 %

33

america.sim.ucm.es

Internet Source

<1 %

34

chaimnoy.com

Internet Source

<1 %

35

jurnal.uisu.ac.id

Internet Source

<1 %

36

repository.uinjkt.ac.id

Internet Source

<1 %

37

turcomat.org

Internet Source

<1 %

38

www.jlls.org

Internet Source

<1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On