

**POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED IN THE FIRST
PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE BETWEEN DONALD TRUMP AND
HILLARY CLINTON**

THESIS

By:

Hamzah Arribath

NIM 12320026



**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK
IBRAHIM MALANG**

2023

**POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED IN THE FIRST
PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE BETWEEN DONALD TRUMP AND
HILLARY CLINTON**

THESIS

Presented to

Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of *Sarjana Sastra* (S.S.)

By:

Hamzah Arribath

NIM 12320026

Advisor:

Vita Nur Santi, M. Pd.

NIP 198306192011012008



**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK
IBRAHIM MALANG**

2023

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

I state that the thesis I wrote to accomplish the requirement for the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S) in English Letters Department, Humanities Faculty, Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University entitled **Politeness Strategies Used in the First Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton** is truly my original work. It does not incorporate any materials previously written or published by other person, except those indicated in quotations and bibliography. Due to that fact, I am the only person who responsible for the thesis if there is any objection or claim from others.

Malang, August 24, 2023



Hamzah Arribath

NIM. 12320026

APPROVAL SHEET

This is to certify that Hamzah Arribath's thesis entitled **Politeness Strategies Used in the First Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton** has been approved by the thesis advisor to be examined.


Malang, August 24, 2023

Approved by
Advisor,



Vita Nur Santi, M. Pd.
NIP. 19830619 201101 2 008

Head of Department of English Literature,



Ribut Wahyudi, M.Ed., Ph.D
NIP. 19811205 201101 1 007

Acknowledged by
Dean,



D. M. Faisol, M.Ag.
NIP. 19741101 200312 1003

LEGITIMATION SHEET

This is to certify that Hamzah Arribath's thesis entitled **Politeness Strategies Used in the First Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton** has been approved by the board of examiners as the requirement for the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S) in English Letters Department, Faculty of Humanities, Maulana Malik Ibrahim State University of Malang.

Malang, August 24, 2023

The Board of Examiners

Signatures

1. Deny Efiti Nur Rakhmawati, M.Pd.

NIP. 19850530 200912 2 006

(Main Examiner)



2. Zainur Rofiq, M.A.

NIP. 19861018 201802 1 118


(Chair)



3. Vita Nur Santi, M.Pd.

NIP. 19830619 201101 2 008

(Advisor)



Approved by

Dean of Faculty of Humanities



Hamzah Arribath, M.Ag.

NIP. 19930101 200312 1003

MOTTO

“Don’t talk, just act

Don’t say, just show

Don’t promise, just prove”

Unknown Person

DEDICATION

This thesis is especially dedicated to my sweet and loving parents Moch. Mas'ud and Trimaningsih, and my only sister Farih Tsabitah for their endless love, support and encouragement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praises are due to Allah SWT, the most Gracious and the Merciful, also the one who always guides and blesses me. Blessing and salutation may be upon our prophet Muhammad SAW, who has been a good figure in the overall of our life. Therefore, I could finish my thesis entitled *Politeness Strategies Used in the First Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton*

This thesis entitled is intended to fulfill the requirement for achieving the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S) in English Letters and Language Department, Faculty of Humanities, Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang.

I thank all who in one way or another contributed in the completion of this thesis. I have to thank to my parents for their loves and supports throughout my life. Thank you both for giving me strength to reach for the stars and chase my dreams. My only sisters deserve my whole-hearted thanks as well.

Special appreciation goes to my advisor, Vita Nur Santi, M.Pd., for her advice and constant support. Her valuable help of constructive comments and suggestions throughout the experimental and thesis works have contributed to the success of this thesis.

Sincere thanks to all my friends especially for those who gave me supports, spirits and help in finishing this final assignment. Thank you for your supports, friendship and beautiful memories.

Finally, I truly realize that in this thesis still need the constructive criticism and suggestions from the readers in order to make it perfect and hopefully it can be more useful to the readers, especially for the English Letters Department students.

Malang, August 04, 2023

The Researcher

Hamzah Arribath

ABSTRAK

Arribath, Hamzah (2019) *Politeness Strategies Used in the First Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton*. Skripsi. Jurusan Sastra Inggris. Fakultas Humaniora. Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Pembimbing: Vita Nur Santi, M.Pd.

Kata Kunci: Strategi kesopanan, debat presiden.

Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan pragmatik untuk menginvestigasi strategi kesopanan yang ditunjukkan atau ditampilkan oleh calon presiden Donald Trump and capres Hillary Clinton dalam debat calon presiden yang berapi-api. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menggambarkan bagaimana strategi kesopanan digunakan atau diaplikasikan dalam debat calon presiden yang pertama antara Donald Trump dan Hillary Clinton.

Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian kualitatif deskriptif. Hal ini menyangkut tentang penggambaran data dalam bentuk ungkapan yang diungkapkan oleh masing-masing kandidat dalam debat calon presiden yang mana terdapat keberadaan strategi kesopanan. Sumber utama dari penelitian ini adalah skrip video dari debat calon presiden antara Donald Trump dan Hillary Clinton. Dalam pelaksanaan penelitian ini, peneliti (1) Mengklasifikasikan, (2) Menginterpretasi, dan (3) Melaporkan data hasil penelitian.

Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa strategi kesopanan yang digunakan oleh calon presiden Donald Trump dan Hillary Clinton berjumlah total 77 kali diungkapkan dalam empat tipe strategi yaitu bald-on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, dan off-record. Pada debat tersebut, strategi bald-on record muncul atau digunakan sebanyak 48 kali, yang mana calon preside Donald Trump menggunakan strategi tersebut sebanyak 32 kali sedangkan calon presiden Hillary Clinton menggunakannya sebanyak 16 kali. Strategi positive politeness muncul sebanyak 15 kali dimana calon presiden Donald Trump menggunakannya sebanyak 12 kali sedangkan calon presiden Hillary Clinton menggunakannya sebanyak 3 kali. Strategi negative politeness muncul sebanyak 7 kali, dimana Donald Trump menggunakannya sebanyak 5 kali sedangkan Hillary Clinton menggunakannya sebanyak 2 kali. Untuk strategi yang terakhir yaitu off-record, muncul sebanyak 7 kali dimana Donald Trump menggunakannya sebanyak 6 kali sedangkan Hillary Clinton menggunakannya hanya sekali. Dari hasil tersebut dapat ditarik kesimpulan bahwa strategi bald-on record merupakan staregi yang paling banyak muncul atau digunakan yaitu sebanyak 48 kali dimana 32 kali digunakan oleh Donald Trump dan 16 kali digunakan oleh Hillary Clinton. Disamping itu, terdapat dua strategi yang dirasa merupakan strategi kesopanan yang paling jarang digunakan oleh masing-masing kandidat, yaitu strategi negative politeness dan off-record dengan angka kemunculan sebanyak hanya 7 kali dari kedua strategi tersebut.

ABSTRACT

Arribath, Hamzah (2019) *Politeness Strategies Used in the First Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton*. Thesis. Department of English Literature. Faculty of Humanities. The State Islamic University Maulana Malik Ibrahim of Malang. The Advisor: Vita Nur Santi, M.Pd.

Key words: Politeness strategies, presidential debate.

This research employs pragmatic approach to investigate politeness strategies performed by Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton in Fiery Presidential Debate. The objectives of this research are to describe how politeness strategies are used in the first Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton.

This research is descriptive qualitative. It is concerned with the description of the data in the form of utterances produced by the candidates in which politeness strategies exist. The primary source is the script of the video. In conducting this research, the researcher (1) classifying, (2) interpreting, and (3) reporting.

The result showed that politeness strategy used by Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton with the number of 77 times in total with four strategies of bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record strategy. Bald on record strategy appeared with the number of 48 times in which Donald Trump performed bald on record strategy in 32 times while Hillary Clinton performed it in 16 times. Positive politeness strategy appeared with the number of 15 times in which Trump performed it in 12 times while Clinton performed it in 3 times. Negative politeness strategy appeared with the number of 7 times in which Trump performed it in 5 times while Clinton performed it in two times. Off record strategy appeared with the number of 7 times in which Trump performed it in 6 times while Clinton performed it once. In this case, the biggest number of performing politeness strategy is the strategy of bald on record which was appeared in 48 times with 32 times performed by Trump and 16 times performed by Clinton. Whereas, there were two strategy which was consider as the most rarely used of politeness strategy, they were negative politeness and off record strategy with both of them appeared in 7 times.

مستخلص البحث

الرباط، حمزة (2019) إستراتيجيات الأدب المستخدمة في المناظرة الرئاسية الأولى بين دونالد ترامب وهيلاري كلينتون. فرضية. البحث الجامعي، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وأدبها. كلية العلوم الإنسانية. جامعة مولانا مالك إبراهيم الإسلامية الحكومية مالانج. المشرف: فيتا نور سانتي، الماجستير.

الكلمات الأساسية: استراتيجية الأدب، المناظرة الرئاسية.

تستخدم هذه البحث نهجا واقعا للتحقيق في استراتيجيات الأدب التي أظهرها أو عرضها الرئاسي دونالد ترامب والمرشحة الرئاسية هيلاري كلينتون في المناظرة الرئاسية طموحا. الهدف من هذه البحث هو وصف كيفية استخدام أو تطبيق استراتيجيات الأدب في المناظرة الرئاسية الأولى بين دونالد ترامب وهيلاري كلينتون.

نوع هذا البحث بحث وصفي نوعي. هذا يتعلق بتصوير البيانات في تعابير يعبر عنها كل مرشح في مناظرة المرشح الرئاسي حيث توجد استراتيجيات الأدب. البيانات ومصادرها نص فيديو للمناظرة الرئاسية بين دونالد ترامب وهيلاري كلينتون. قام الباحث في إجراء (1) توضيح (2) تفسير (3) تقرير لبيانات البحث.

النتائج هذا البحث أن استراتيجيات الأدب التي استخدمها المرشحان الرئاسيان دونالد ترامب وهيلاري كلينتون بلغ مجموعها 77 مرة معبراً عنها في أربعة أنواع من الاستراتيجيات، وهي: الصلح، والتأدب الإيجابي، والتأدب السلبي، والغير رسمية. في المناظرة، ظهرت الإستراتيجية الثابتة أو تم استخدامها 48 مرة، استخدم منها المرشح الرئاسي دونالد ترامب الإستراتيجية 32 مرة بينما استخدمتها المرشحة الرئاسية هيلاري كلينتون 16 مرة. ظهرت استراتيجيات الأدب الإيجابية 15 مرة حيث استخدمها المرشح الرئاسي دونالد ترامب 12 مرة بينما استخدمتها المرشحة الرئاسية هيلاري كلينتون 3 مرات. تظهر استراتيجيات الأدب السلبي 7 مرات، حيث يستخدمها دونالد ترامب 5 مرات بينما تستخدمها هيلاري كلينتون مرتين. بالنسبة للإستراتيجية الأخيرة، غير الرسمية، ظهرت 7 مرات حيث استخدمها دونالد ترامب 6 مرات بينما استخدمتها هيلاري كلينتون مرة واحدة فقط. يستنتج أن إستراتيجية التسجيلات الصلبة هي الإستراتيجية الأكثر ظهوراً أو مستخدمة 48 مرة، استخدم منها دونالد ترامب 32 مرة واستخدمتها هيلاري كلينتون 16 مرة. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، هناك استراتيجيتان تعتبران أقل إستراتيجيات الأدب المستخدمة من قبل كل مرشح، وهما التأدب السلبي والاستراتيجيات غير الرسمية مع حدوث 7 حالات فقط من الاستراتيجيتين.

TABLE OF CONTENT

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP.....	ii
APPROVAL SHEET	iii
LEGITIMATION SHEET	iv
MOTTO.....	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vii
ABSTRACT.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENT	xi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background of the Study.....	1
1. Problem of Study	9
2. Objectives of the Study	9
3. Significance of the Study.....	9
4. Scope and Delimitations.....	10
5. Research Method.....	10
a) Research Design	10
b) Data Source	11
c) Data Collections.....	11
d) Data Analysis.....	12
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
A. Pragmatics	13
B. Face Wants, FSA and FTA	14
C. Politeness Strategies	15
1. Bald-on Record Strategy.....	16
2. Positive politeness strategy	16
3. Negative politeness strategy	17
4. Off-Record.....	18
D. Debate.....	18
E. Previous Studies.....	20

CHAPTER III: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	23
A. Findings	23
1. Bald-on Record Strategies	24
2. Positive Politeness Strategies.....	64
3. Negative Politeness Strategies	76
4. Off-Record Strategies	83
B. Discussion.....	89
CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION.....	93
A. Conclusion	93
B. Suggestion.....	94
BIBLIOGRAPHY	95
CURRICULUM VITAE	97

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the introduction of the research. It consists of background of the study, problem of the study, objectives of the study, significance of the study, scope and delimitation, and research methods.

A. Background of the Study

Communication is one of the most important aspects of human life. By doing the act of communication, people are able to deliver their ideas and opinions, share information, and make a certain relation to others. People have their own way to communicate with others. One of the ways is having a conversation. It is a good way for people to obtain a piece of new information or idea that they do not know yet. However, the conversation sometimes gives an unexpected goal because of unavoidable misunderstanding between the speaker and the hearer. This may be influenced by certain reasons. Considering someone's attitude would be the most crucial thing. People prefer to keep the conversation going up to the end by considering the right way of uttering and using the appropriate word. In the case of communication, the speaker will choose the strategies to have a polite conversation.

Meanwhile, one of the most useful strategies is politeness. Brown and Levinson (1978) state that "recognizes what people are doing in verbal exchange (e.g. requesting, offering, criticizing, complaining, etc.) not so much by what they overtly claim to be doing as in the fine linguistics details of utterances."

It means that not only speaking in fine language but also considering other's feelings is important. Politeness is universal that it can be observed as a phenomenon in all cultures. Politeness is a very important principle in language use. Holmes (1992) stated that politeness may be defined as taking account of the feelings of others. Politeness is someone's method of conveying anything in communicating with others. Politeness can also be defined as a tool to aware of someone's courtliness when they are doing conversation. In a certain communication, it can be a conversation or a single speech, the speaker and the hearer have a right to being respected one to another. It is closely related to the concept of face. Face means public self-image. In another word, "to aware someone's face" means how people know or treat their interlocutor's self-image of being respected. Another definition was proposed that "Politeness is showing awareness of another person's face; it was related to social distance or closeness" George Yule (1996). In this case, politeness is a way of someone's expression to oversee the intention in mitigating face-threatening acts. In other words, politeness refers to someone's manner to respect others in case of communication. Politeness theory is the theory that accounts for redressing of the affronts to the face posed by face-threatening acts to addressees. First formulated in 1978 by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, politeness theory has since expanded academia's perception of politeness. Mills (2005) stated that this text has influenced almost all of the theoretical and analytical work in this field.

Politeness strategies are used by people to ensure smooth communication and harmonious interpersonal relationship in contradictive or non-contradictive

social communication. Watts (2003) found that the politeness instructs the interactants to produce a harmonious interaction socially. Since the mentioned statements, a certain situation or condition may also influence the conversation. Sometimes the situation makes its participants threaten each other, for real example is in a debate. The participants are officially invited by the government or any other institution to provide their arguments and impress the whole audience. The main goal is obtaining the strongest and the most convincing arguments about a certain idea. In this case, politeness strategies take their role to make a perfect result. In this case, the “perfect result” of a conversation is meant as when the speaker and the interlocutor reach the conversation in an effective way and the participant maintains the cooperative principle. Paul Grice in 1975 proposed a principle of conversation (cooperative principle), in which the participants expect that each will make a conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange. The cooperative principle describes how people achieve effective conversation by acting cooperatively and mutually accepting one to another to be understood in a particular way.

Politeness has influenced many aspects of communication nowadays. There are many studies about politeness which is conducted to cover recent phenomena of linguistics. The main is to describe how politeness applied in a particular phenomenon. For instance, in the study of analyzing politeness used by the main character in a movie. This is one of the most interesting topics in which it is analyzing how the main character uses politeness in his/her social

relationship, what strategy mostly appears in his/her utterances of the conversation. It is quite similar to the topic of analyzing politeness in a particular novel or any other work of fiction. Another study of analyzing politeness was conducted in the context of the Arabic debate. it is a very interesting topic due to the study analyzing how politeness applied in the Arabic language and what strategy mostly appears. However, this study is conducted to cover the linguistics phenomenon about politeness used in terms of the debate.

Freely and Steinberg (2009) stated that debate is the process of inquiry and advocacy, a way of arriving at a reasoned judgment on a proposition. Every single side or party will provide its arguments, give a reason by using a certain strategy in order to be discussed by the other side. Moreover, the participants will express their own points of view to maintain or empower their arguments and to get respect from the audiences to their self-image. Debates also create conditions for candidates to engage in aggressive argumentation strategies in their attempts to appeal to supporters and demonstrate dominance over the opposing candidate. In a normal daily conversation, the speaker and the hearer try to respect self-image in order to keep the relation harmony and to maintain cooperative principle as Yule (1996) stated, “the participants of a conversation tend to obey the cooperative principle and its maxims. Speakers sometimes use an additional unstated meaning that has to be assumed in order to maintain a cooperative principle.” However, in a debate, the participants will express their own points of view to maintain their arguments and to get respect public self-image from the audiences. Due to this

reason, this study is conducted to cover how politeness treats the conversation in terms of the debate.

In a presidential or governmental election, the debate will be an interesting campaign event because they call for candidates to cooperate while engaging in argumentative discourse. The stakes are high because of the large viewing audiences they draw and the potential damage that can be done to a candidate's image, should the candidate fail to defend him or herself against attack. These conditions can create clashes over issues that have developed in the campaign, including questions about character, policies, records, and more. Candidates and campaign staffs may try to anticipate the opponent's attacking arguments and plan responses to show themselves capable of handling such threats. This will be the uniqueness of the study since it analyzes about politeness strategies in a presidential debate over candidates' characters, attacking and defending tactics of arguing, disagreement, even strategies of ridicule.

The presidential debate of the United States of America would be the most appropriate object of conducting this research. In this case, the first presidential debate was the biggest political event in America at that time. The main reason why the debate becomes an interesting topic to be analyzed is that because the presidential candidates have their own styles in delivering their speech professionally. In the first presidential debate, they have different assumptions in using politeness strategies. For example, Donald Trump focuses on his attempt to build a better America in the future while Hillary Clinton tries to focus on staying close with American people. Trump gives some examples of issues in America

and he tries to persuade the audiences. On the other hand, Clinton tries to convince the audiences by using her feeling to catch their attention. This kind of interaction provides a big area of politeness strategies investigations in the context of a debate.

Talking about two potential candidates, Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, they had a different background of life. Donald Trump is a rich man of building Developer Company, and Hillary Clinton is the 67th secretary of America in Obama's regime. The topic of the debate is about the economy and the fiercest debate happens in part of discussing jobs, trade agreement and taxes. This ninety-minute debate puts the situation where participants attack each other by providing their best ideas based on their field of science. The researcher chooses a presidential debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton to be the object of the research under some considerations. The conversations contain argumentative conversation that involves some different ideas or perspectives. The diversity of perspective sometimes causes some misunderstandings between the speaker and the hearer. The uniqueness of this study is that how politeness employed in terms of rivalry.

Here is the example of politeness strategies in the first presidential debate of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton:

“Clinton: I also want to see more companies do profit-sharing. If you help create the profits, you should be able to share in them, not just the executives at the top.”

The underlined sentence above is the example of politeness strategies which is used by one of the candidates, Secretary Clinton. She used bald on record in

which her utterance contains suggestions. It is indicated by using the word “should” which performs the act of suggestion. She tried to show her capability to be the president by giving suggestions about economic issues to put more money into the pocket of Americans. She said that if you help create the profit, you should be able to share into middle-class business, not just executive class at the top.

There are some studies that have been done by previous researchers on the same topic such as politeness strategies, yet they have a difference in subjects and theories. Furthermore, this research has a relation to the previous researchers on the same topic such as; Hasan (2016), who conducted *the study of politeness and face in the 2013 presidential election candidates of Iran*. He found that the most frequent strategy used is bald on record. The other study was conducted by Nailah (2016) who analyzed *politeness strategies used by the main characters in “Transformers: Age of extinction” movie*. She found some politeness strategies used by the main characters in the movie. The strategies are positive politeness strategies, negative politeness strategies, bald on record and off-record strategies. Another study was conducted by Yuni (2013), analyzing about *politeness strategies used by George Milton in John Steinbeck’s of Mice and Men*. She analyzed the politeness strategies used by the main character in the novel of Mice and Men. She found that there are three kinds of politeness strategies, they are bald-on record strategy, positive politeness strategies, and negative politeness strategies.

However, this research has different focus and subject analysis toward the previous studies. Most of the researchers analyzed politeness strategies in used in the work of fiction such as novel, movie, etc., for example, analyzing politeness strategies used by the main characters in “Transformers: Age of extinction” movie, and politeness strategies used by George Milton in John Steinbeck’s of Mice and Men. Whereas, this study puts the focus on analyzing politeness strategies in the debate. In addition, the subject of this study is the first presidential debate in which this subject is a real event of a life or not a fictive works. Thus, this is a significant difference from the previous study.

Moreover, some other researchers indeed have been conducted the studies on the same topic and also subject, analyzing politeness strategies used in debate, for example in the study of politeness which is conducted by Hasan (2016) that is presidential election debate in Iran. The significant difference from the study and the present study is the context that is Hasan has conducted the study in the Arabic language while the researcher of this study conducted in English. However, this study will focus on politeness strategies used in the first presidential debate of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton in which the context will be different from the studies above.

Further, the researcher uses the Brown and Levinson’s theory to analyze the use of politeness strategies in the first presidential debate of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. Brown and Levinson propose that politeness strategies are used to show awareness of someone’s face. Moreover, Brown and Levinson divided the politeness strategies into four types. Each type of politeness strategy

has a different function depending on the context and the manner of uttering the sentence. Hence, the researcher assumes that Brown and Levinson's model is the most suitable theory in conducting this study.

1. Problem of Study

From the discussion above, one main question is given, that is "How are politeness strategies applied in the first presidential debate of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton?"

2. Objectives of the Study

To answer the research question above, this study is conducted to investigate politeness strategies applied in the first presidential debate of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. Besides, this study is conducted to analyze politeness strategies used in the first presidential debate of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. Furthermore, this study intends on how politeness strategies are applied in the first presidential debate of Donald Trump and Hilary Clinton.

3. Significance of the Study

The result of this research is expected to give a theoretical and practical contribution to the field of education or in language and the field of science. Theoretically, this research is expected to give contribution to the field of linguistics, especially in the case of communicating attitude. Practically, this research is expected to provide an obvious example of politeness strategy applied in society. Furthermore, it is expected to support the study of pragmatics, especially about politeness strategies in academic degrees.

4. Scope and Delimitations

This study is focused on analyzing the politeness strategies used in the utterances of the first presidential debate participants, they are the candidates Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. This study analyzes the utterances which contains politeness strategies used by the participants of the first presidential debate by using the theory of Brown and Levinson who proposed four strategies of politeness, such as bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off record. The researcher delimits in analyzing the utterances which contain the use of politeness strategies in the first presidential debate participants.

5. Research Method

This part discusses the method used in the study which comprises the research design, data source, data collection and data analysis.

a) Research Design

This research uses descriptive qualitative design since the collected data are in the form of words and sentences rather than numbers and counts. In addition, the hypothesis is not formulated at the beginning of the study since the researcher merely describes the politeness used in the debate and discusses it descriptively through Brown and Levinson's theory. Therefore, this study uses descriptive qualitative design because the data are the utterances of the participants in the first presidential debate of Trump and Hillary.

In this case, this study uses a pragmatic approach since the topic is about politeness strategies. Pragmatics is a study of contextual meaning in which it

depends on the interpretation of what people mean in the particular context and how the context influences what is uttered. Besides, this research focuses on politeness strategies to analyze the presidential debate. Politeness refers to the means of showing awareness to another person's face and it deals with context and situation in which discourse used. Afterward, this research will be conducted using Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness strategies.

b) Data Source

The source of the main data in this research is a presidential debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. The data of this research are in the form of words, phrases, and sentences that appear in the first presidential debate since that the debate was the most-watched debate in American history, with 84 million viewers. The researcher obtains the data in the form of textual conversation in the script which is downloaded from Google. The criteria for selecting data are the utterances of Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton and also the host Holt Lester which contain the use of politeness strategies.

c) Data Collections

In data collection, the data will be collected through the following steps. Firstly, the researcher initially prints out the script of the first presidential debate. The script is taken from the internet and copied into a Word file. Afterward, the researcher finds the indicator of the politeness strategies in the conversation by reading the script and understanding the context. The researcher finds the data that contain the expression of politeness strategies (bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record). The data will be put into the classification

which is based on the contexts of the debate, they are a context of expressing the idea, responding or replying, interrupting and overlapping.

d) Data Analysis

In data analysis, the researcher will observe the data in the script of debate through Brown and Levinson's theory to find politeness strategies. Firstly, the researcher finds the indicator of politeness strategies in the conversations to obtain the utterance which contains the politeness strategies. The selected data then will be gathered, listed and categorized into four types of politeness strategies. Afterward, each type of politeness strategy will be analyzed by using the Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness strategies to answer the problem of the study. In the last step, the researcher will draw the conclusion of the politeness strategies used in the first presidential debate of Donald Trump and Hilary Clinton.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This second chapter contains some theories and references, which are related to the research. It involves pragmatics, face wants, politeness strategies, self and others: say nothing, say something: on and off the record, negative and positive politeness, debate, and previous studies.

A. Pragmatics

Pragmatics according to Levinson (1985:21) is the study of the relation between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding. He also states that pragmatics is the study of the relation between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language (1985:9). In studying language, one cannot ignore the situation which is the speech is uttered. There is a close relationship between utterance and situations. Thus, pragmatics includes the relevant context or situation, instead of language usage.

Meanwhile, Yule (1996:3) pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance. Closeness, whether it is physical, social, or conceptual, implies shared experience. How close or distant the listener is speakers determine how much needs to be said. Similarly, Leech (1983) gives a definition that pragmatics can be usefully defined as the study of how utterances have meanings in situations. From his definition, it can be seen that pragmatics is a study, which understands the meanings of utterances by looking at the situation when the utterances happen.

Based on the definition above, it can be said that pragmatics is the study of meaning contained the utterance in context. Therefore, in a pragmatic view, to appreciate and to interpret the meaning of a statement or an utterance, one must consider the relationship between language and context in which the situation is uttered.

B. Face Wants, FSA and FTA

Politeness is a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by human interaction by minimizing, potential conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange (Yule, 1996:106). In communication, politeness can be defined as the means to show awareness of another person's face. Face means the public self-image of a person. It refers to that emotional and social sense of self that every person has and expects everyone else to recognize (Yule, 1996:134). Face wants means a people behavior that their expectations concern to their public self-image will be respected.

According to Brown and Levinson (1978:66), face means something that is emotionally invested. It can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction. According to Fasold (1996:160), the face has two aspects, namely 'positive' and 'negative'. Negative face is the desire to have freedom of action, freedom of imposition, and not to be impeded by others. Positive face is the need to be appreciated and accepted, to be treated as a member of the same group, and to know that his or her wants are shared by others.

George Yule (1996, p. 61) stated that the face-threatening act is when a speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual's expectations regarding self-image. Meanwhile, Face saving act is when someone says something to lessen the possible threat.

C. Politeness Strategies

Politeness strategy is basically the study of awareness towards the way people use the language while they are having communication. It describes how to use the language and have the conversation in order to run well and smoothly.

In the case of communication, people have their own public self-image or face that they want to be understood and respected, or not to be disturbed by others. This is why the concept of face is something that is emotionally invested, enhanced, maintained and constantly attended in a communication. Hence, this study focuses on politeness strategies recommended by Brown and Levinson.

According to Brown and Levinson in Goody (1996), politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearer's face. Face refers to a certain act of respect that everyone has for him or herself and maintaining the "self-esteem" in a certain situation. Besides, Goffman (1993) stated that the concept of face as an image is projected by a person in his social contacts with others. The face has the meaning as in the saying to the loose fact. Brown and Levinson in Thomas (1995, p. 169) state that certain speech act is liable to damage or threaten another person's face; such as known as Face Threatening Acts. In order to reduce the

FTAs Brown and Levinson sum up four main types of politeness strategy, namely bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and bald off record.

1. Bald-on Record Strategy

Bald on record strategy does not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer's face. This strategy is most often utilized by the speakers who closely know their audience. With the bald on record strategy, there is a direct possibility that the audience will be shocked or embarrassed by the strategy. Bald on-record strategy including:

- Cases of non-minimization of the face threat. For example: “*Watch it!*”, “*Do the dishes. It's your turn.*” (Instructing someone)
- Cases of FTA-oriented usage. It includes three strategies:
 1. Welcoming: *come in, don't hesitate, I'm not busy.*
 2. Greeting and Farewell: *I'm staying, you go!*
 3. Offers: *Don't bother, I'll clean it up / leave it to me.*

2. Positive politeness strategy

Positive politeness represents the want of every participant of conversation that his/her wants to be desirable to at least some others. Another definition if positive politeness strategy according to Brown and Levinson (1987:70) is aimed to satisfy the positive face of the hearer by approving or including him as a friend or as a member of a group. A speaker can apply positive politeness to give an impression to the speaker wants what the speaker wants. Positive politeness also

contributes to establishing a relationship or intimacy and solidarity. According to Brown and Levinson, positive politeness strategy including:

- Attend to hearer's interests, need, wants: *You look sad. Can I do anything?*
- Use solidarity in-group identity: *Hey mate, can you lend me a dollar?*
- Be optimistic: *I'll just come along, if you don't mind.*
- Include both speaker and hearer in activity: *If we help each other, I guess, we will both sink or swim in this course.*
- Offer or promise: *If you wash the dishes, I'll vacuum the floor.*
- Exaggerate interest in hearer and his interest: *That's a nice haircut you got, where did you get it?*
- Avoid disagreement: *Yes, it's rather long, not short certainly.*
- Joke: *Wow, that's a whopper!*

3. Negative politeness strategy

Negative politeness is also known as respect politeness where a participant in the social process has the need not to be disturbed and not to be free. Negative politeness presumes that the speaker will be imposing on the hearer. The potential for awkwardness is greater than in bald on record strategy and positive politeness strategy. Negative face is the desire to have freedom of action. Thus, a request without consideration of the hearer's negative face might be uncomfortable. Negative face according to Brown and Levinson including:

- Be Indirect: *“Would you know where Oxford street is?”*
- Use hedges or questions: *“Could you pass the rice?”*
- Be pessimistic: *“You couldn’t find your way to lend me a thousand dollars, could you? So I suppose some help is out of the question, then?”*
- Apologize: *“I’m sorry, it is a lot of ask, but can you lend me a thousand dollars?”*

4. Off-Record

Off-record is taking some pressures off of the hearer. In this case, the speaker performs an act in a vague manner that could be interpreted by the hearer as some other acts. Off-record utterance usually uses indirect language that constructs more general utterance or actually different from what one means. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), off-record strategy enables the speaker to have one interpretation of his act. Off-record including:

- Give Hints: *“This room is hot.”*
- Give association clues: *“I think its burrow is two blocks down. If you go past.”*
- Presuppose: *“I wash the car again today.”*
- Understate: *”He is good”*

D. Debate

According to Karl Popper in his blog, a debate is a formal contest of argumentation between two teams or individuals. More broadly, and more importantly, a debate is an essential tool for developing and maintaining

democracy and open societies. More than a mere verbal or performance skill, debate embodies the ideals of reasoned argument, tolerance for divergent points of view and rigorous self-examination. The debate is, above all, a way for those who hold opposing views to discuss controversial issues without descending to insult, emotional appeals or personal bias.

The 2016 United States presidential election debates were a series of debates held for the 2016 U.S. presidential general election. The Commission on Presidential Debates (CPD), a bipartisan organization formed in 1987, organized three debates among the major presidential candidates. The first presidential debate for the 2016 election took place on September 26, 2016, and set the record as the most-watched debate in American history, with 84 million viewers. The debate brings an interesting performing of the candidates of U.S president. They are Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton.

Real estate developer Donald John Trump was born in 1946, in Queens, New York. In 1971, he became involved in large, profitable building projects in Manhattan. In 1980, he opened the Grand Hyatt, which made him the city's best-known developer. In 2004, Trump began starring in the hit NBC reality series *The Apprentice*, which also spawned the offshoot *The Celebrity Apprentice*. Trump turned his attention to politics, and in 2015 he announced his candidacy for president of the United States on the Republican ticket. After winning a majority of the primaries and caucuses, Trump became the official Republican candidate for president on July 19, 2016. That November, Trump was elected the 45th

President of the United States when he defeated Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton.

Hillary Clinton was born on October 26, 1947, in Chicago, Illinois, going on to earn her law degree from Yale University. She married fellow law school graduate Bill Clinton in 1975. She later served as the first lady from 1993 to 2001, and then as a U.S. senator from 2001 to 2009. In early 2007, Clinton announced her plans to run for the presidency. During the 2008 Democratic primaries, she conceded the nomination when it became apparent that Barack Obama held a majority of the delegate vote. After winning the national election, Obama appointed Clinton secretary of state. She was sworn in as part of his cabinet in January 2009 and served until 2013. In the spring of 2015, she announced her plans to run again for the U.S. presidency. In 2016, she became the first woman in U.S. history to become the presidential nominee of a major political party. After a polarizing campaign against GOP candidate Donald Trump, Clinton was defeated in the general election that November.

E. Previous Studies

The researcher found some previous studies analyzing about politeness strategies. The first study is conducted by Hasan (2016), analyzing *the study of politeness and face in 2013 presidential election candidates of Iran*. He found some of the candidates answered the question more indirectly by giving clues, hints, and in some cases incomplete answers. The other candidates answered

based on positive strategies by noticing or attending to hearers, concerning for hearer's wants, offering or promising, avoiding disagreement, being optimistic, and other communicative strategies. The candidates mostly use positive politeness strategies and negative politeness strategies rather than off-record. The number of candidates who use positive politeness strategies is four candidates while the number of negative politeness strategies is two candidates. Whereas, the lack of off-record sentences appeared as a significance result toward the whole candidates. Overall, this study has the same topic as the current study that is politeness strategies. However, this previous study analyzes the use of politeness strategies in the aspect of the Arabic language.

The other study was conducted by Yuni Murliati (2013), which is entitled *Politeness Strategies Used by George Milton In John Steinbeck's of Mice and Men*. The study is analyzing the use of politeness strategies which are stated in a novel. The study uses Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness strategies in analyzing the data. The result of the analysis shows that George Milton gives commands more than requests and suggestions. There are 35 commands, 20 requests, and 5 suggestions. He tends to apply bald on record strategy, in giving commands. However, in requesting and suggesting, he mostly uses positive and negative politeness strategies. The choices of certain strategies are influenced by George's consideration for the addressees' face, the context of the situation and the addressees' condition. Moreover, this study is quite similar to the current study in the aspect of the topic. The most significant difference is the object of the

study that this study analyzes the main character of a novel, while the current study analyzes the participants of the presidential debate.

The other study was conducted by Nailah (2016) who analyzed politeness strategies used by the main characters in “*Transformers: Age of extinction*” movie. She found some politeness strategies used by the main characters in the movie. She analyzes the utterances of the main characters of “*Transformers: Age of Extinction*” movie by using politeness strategies theory which is proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). She found that Cade Yaeger and Tessa perform all kinds of politeness strategies in conversation, they are positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategies, bald-on record, and off-record. There are 20 of 30 utterances which contain politeness strategies in Cade Yaeger and Tessa’s conversation. Bald-on record strategy is the most frequently used by Cade Yaeger and Tessa by the number of ten (10). The second is the positive politeness strategy by nine (9), the third is negative politeness strategy by seven (7), and the last is off-record by only one (1). This study has the same topic as the current study, it is politeness strategies. However, the object of the study is also being a significant difference, where this study analyzes the movie as the object while the current study takes the presidential debate. Besides, the distinction of the basic theoretical framework used would be another difference between this study and the previous studies. As we know that this study was conducted through the theory of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson while the previous study used another theoretical framework to analyze the data.

CHAPTER III: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Findings

This chapter presents the result of data analysis that covers the description of politeness strategies used in the first presidential debate of America between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton based on Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness. The data will be analyzed based on the context of a debate. There are at least four contexts in a debate, they are the context of expressing an idea, responding or replying, interrupting, and overlapping.

In the context of expressing ideas or arguments, marked by (Data 1), it happens in a debate when the participants have their two minutes of giving their arguments or ideas regarding the topic discussion. The data which contain the use of politeness strategy will be presented in (Data 1.1, Data 1.2 . . .etc.). In the context of responding or replying, marked by (Data 2), it happens in a debate when one of the participants tries to respond to the argument of another participant. The data which contain the use of politeness strategy will be presented in (Data 2.1, Data 2.2 . . .etc.). In the context of interrupting, marked by (Data3), it happens in a debate when one of the participants takes another participant's turn of speaking. The data which contain the use of politeness strategy will be presented in (Data 3.1, Data 3.2 . . .etc.). In the context of overlapping, marked by (Data 4), it happens in a debate when one of the participants interrupts the other participant while he or she is speaking so that they are speaking simultaneously. The data which contain the use of politeness strategy will be presented in (Data

4.1, Data 4.2 . . .etc.). The detail explanation will be presented in such an analysis below.

1. Bald-on Record Strategies

a) Giving Arguments

Data 1.1:

“...you should be able to share in them, not just the executives at the top.”
(Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

Hillary Clinton was given the first answer to the host’s question, Lester, in the first segment with the topic of achieving prosperity. By the question of “why Hillary Clinton was a better choice than the opponent to create the kinds of jobs that will put more money into the pockets of American works”, Clinton expressed her argument to answer the question.

Analysis:

In this case, the speaker used bald on record strategy to do FTA with maximum efficiency to satisfy the audience’s face. Clinton tried to do FTA baldly while she minimized face threat by implication by giving suggestions. She tried to show her capability in leading the country by giving suggestions regarding economic issues to achieve prosperity in America. Here, Clinton said

that to create the profit by doing profit-sharing with the middle-class business done by the executive companies.

Data 1.2 & Data 1.3:

“But *we have to* stop our jobs from being stolen from us.” (Donald Trump)

“*We have to* stop our companies from leaving the United States” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

By the same question as above from the host, Donald Trump had the second turn to answer the question. He expressed his arguments on how achieving prosperity.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump as the speaker used bald on record to do FTA. He gave the suggestion in his idea to the audiences. He minimized the audience's face by implicating suggestion. He tried to show his capability to be the elected president by giving suggestion to put more money into the pocket of American works. He said that to achieve prosperity, America has to stop the job from being stolen in order to the companies that are not leaving the United States.

Data 1.4:

“*We have to* renegotiate our trade deals.” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The utterance is stated in the first segment of the debate. In this sentence, Donald Trump tried to give another additional suggestion about how to achieve prosperity in his argument.

Analysis:

In this case, the speaker used bald on record strategy to do FTA to satisfy the hearer's face. He tried to do FTA baldly on record and he wanted to minimize the face threat. He gave suggestions to the hearer to satisfy their faces. He tried to show his capability to lead the country since he looked very forward to the company. He thought that America should renegotiate the trade deal in order for the companies and the jobs are not leaving the country.

Data 1.5:

“Secretary Clinton and others, politicians, *should have been doing* this for years, not right now...” (Donald trump)

Context of Data:

In this sentence, Donald Trump talked about the tax system which is running in America. He gave argument by the fact that the tax system is now defective and it has been running for 30 years. He said that what Clinton plan sounds good, but it is very recently.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy to do FTA. He did the FTA baldly, but he tried to minimize the face threat. The threat minimization was implicated in his suggestion. He suggested Secretary Clinton and another politician to do the better system for years ago, not right now.

Data 1.6:

“Well, *the first thing you do is* don’t let the jobs leave.” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

In this sentence, Donald Trump gave a direct suggestion regarding the issue of American manufacturers and jobs. Trump answered the host’s question about how does he bring back jobs.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy. He wanted to do FTA with the maximum efficiency more than he wants to satisfy the hearer’s face. He did the FTA baldly on record, while he tried to minimize the face threat. He implicated what he means in his suggestion. He showed his competence to lead the country by giving suggestions toward the issues. He emphasized the audiences that the first thing and the most important thing America does is don’t let the jobs leave.

Data 1.7:

“We have to restore trust between communities and the police.” (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered by Hillary Clinton in the segment of America’s directions. The important issue to be rose up is about race relations in America that are known as a bad relation between Africans-Americans. The question from the host is addressed to Clinton about how she heals the divide.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy. She wanted to do the FTA baldly on record with the minimization of face threat by implicating her certain meaning to satisfy the hearer’s face. She suggested several things to do at the same time, one of them is America has to restore trust between communities and the police. She thought that the highest case is the shootings of African-Americans by police. She tried to show her capability to solve the problem by giving a basic important thing to do, it is restoring the trust between communities and the police. She thought that everyone should be respected by the law, and everyone should respect the law.

Data 1.8 & Data 1.9:

“And *we need* law and order.” (Donald Trump)

“*We have to* bring back law and order.” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is Donald Trump’s answer to the same question in the segment of America’s direction. Trump expressed his idea regarding the issue of race relations and the discussion was talking about shootings done by African-American police to the young man.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy. He wanted to do the FTA baldly on record to satisfy the hearer’s face. He tried to do FTA with minimizing the face threat by implication. Trump showed his competence on how to solve the problem by giving suggestions to run the law and order to heal the divide. He thought that since Barrack Obama became president there were many shootings happened and America has to stop this violence. Trump thought that America should bring back the law and order which is not working since the president of Barrack Obama.

Data 1.10:

“*Our country’s in deep trouble.* We don’t know what we’re doing when it comes to devaluations and all of these countries all over the world, especially

China. They're the best, the best ever at it. What they're doing to us is a very, very sad thing." (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The sentence above is stated by Donald Trump in the first segment of the debate with the topic of achieving the prosperity of America. In this case, Trump said that America is in deep trouble. He tried to warn the audience that the country is in the kind of that situation. He said the warning in a direct way since he did not minimize the threat.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in expressing his idea. He wanted to do FTA with maximum efficiency without minimizing the face threat. He directly let the audiences know that America does not know what to do when it comes to devaluations while China is the best nations at facing the devaluation. He did not minimize the threat to express the warning in which he used a direct way of uttering the warning in his responding. The situation indicated that the speaker did care about the hearer so much and for this reason, the redress was not required.

Data 1.11:

"Yeah, well, *let's start the clock again*, Lester." (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the second segment of the debate with the topic of taxes. In this case, Clinton asked the host to restart the clock for her two minutes turn because Trump interrupts her at the beginning of her turn. Clinton used the words “let’s start” to express an imperative form to give a direct command to the host.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy in expressing her idea. She tried to do FTA without minimizing the face threat since she wanted to do the FTA with the maximum efficiency. She tried to do the FTA baldly on record as it was indicated in her words of containing order or entreaties which was considered as imperatives. In this situation, she spoke as if imploring the hearer to care for her. Thereby, it was stressing her high valuation of the hearer’s relationship.

b) Replying

Data 2.1:

“And we need to have smart, fair trade deals.” (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

In this sentence, Hillary Clinton tried to respond the Trump’s statement about the trade deal issue. Clinton thought that the trade deal is an important issue,

but the most important is that America has fair trade deals. She proposed a suggestion that is better than what Trump proposed about the trade deal issue.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategies. She wanted to do the FTA baldly on record with face threat minimization by making implication. She tried to express what she means in her responding to Trump's argument. She tried to show her capability in making deals that give an advantage to American people.

Data 2.2:

“We also, though, need to have a tax system that rewards work and not just financial transactions.” (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

Hillary Clinton tried to respond to what Trump proposed about trade deals and gave another suggestion about the tax system. Clinton thought that Trump's plan about tax is the most extreme version of tax cuts. She had a better plan than Trump about the tax system that it should be a reward word and not just financial transactions.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy. She wanted to do the FTA baldly with minimizing the face threat of the hearer by giving implication.

The actual meaning is that she tried to show that what Trump proposed was not as good as he proposed. She minimized it by giving suggestions in her responding toward Trump's argument.

Data 2.3:

"We have to do a much better job of keeping our jobs. And we have to do a much better job at giving companies" (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

Donald Trump's statement above is a kind of response toward what Clinton proposed about solar panels. According to Clinton, solar panels can build a new modern electric grid that make a lot of jobs. From this case, Trump tried to respond regarding the issue of solar panels by giving a suggestion that what America has to do is keeping the jobs much better. He thought that, by fact, solar panels had a bad record in America. Plenty of money was lost on that one because of the American energy policies. Trump thought that it is much better if America keeps what they have rather that creates a lot of jobs but losing a lot of money too.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy to do the FTA. In doing the FTA, he tried to minimize the face threat by giving implication. The actual meaning is that what he planned will be better that since he gave the suggestion

on his responding toward Clinton's argument. He tried to show his competence to give a better solution than Clinton.

Data 2.4:

“But *I think we have to* look very strongly at no-fly lists and watch lists.”
(Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

In this statement, Donald Trump tried to give a suggestion by responding the Clinton's proposed about the issue of implicit bias of the police toward black people. Trump thought that he wanted to give certain rights to people on the watch list and no-fly list. He suggested looking very strongly in this case. When people are on that lists, even if they shouldn't be on there, Trump thought that America will help them legally and help them get off.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his responding. He wanted to do FTA with minimizing the face threat by making implication. He tried to show that he had a better plan than Clinton regarding the issue. He tried to show his capacity to look very strongly at the no-fly list and watch list.

Data 2.5:

“I think *we need to* do much more with our tech companies...” (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

This statement was uttered by Hillary Clinton in responding to what Donald Trump’s proposed in the segment of securing America with the issue of a cyberattack of ISIS. Trump stated that people came in and out with the internet, and look what ISIS did on the internet, they were beating us at our own game. By this statement, Hillary Clinton gave her suggestion that America needs to do much more with the tech companies to prevent ISIS and their operatives from being able to use the internet to radicalize, even direct people in America, Europe and elsewhere.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy in her responding. She wanted to do FTA with the maximum efficiency more than she wanted. In doing the FTA, she minimized the face threat by making implication. The implicated meaning is that she tried to her capability on resolving the problem. Her suggestion was considered to be a better solution than Trump’s regarding the issue discussed.

Data 2.6:

“...then *he should* tell us what his alternative would be.” (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

This sentence is stated by Hillary Clinton in responding to Trump's argument about the issue of nuclear weapons. Trump mentioned some deals which Clinton made with other nations about nuclear and he said that was the worst deal ever. He tried to treat Clinton by mentioning the bad deals she made with some countries. Clinton tried to respond that by giving a suggestion as defending herself. She said that Trump should tell all the audiences and Clinton too what his alternative would be. She added that Trump had a plan to defeat ISIS, he had a secret plan, but the only secret is that he has no plan.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy in her responding. She tried to do FTA with maximum efficiency to satisfy the hearer's face. In doing the FTA, she minimized the face threat by implication. She tried to show her capacity in solving the problem regarding the issue. She tried to express that at least she did the deals although they were bad deals. It was better than Trump in which he did not have anything to do.

Data 2.7:

“HOLT: So, it's negotiable?”

TRUMP: *It's not negotiable, no.* Let her release the e-mails. Why did she delete 33,000..."

Context of Data:

The dialogue above was stated in the second segment of the debate about taxes. The host tried to cover up the issue of a not released tax return by Trump. Americans know that Trump was perfectly free to release his tax during the audit, but he did not release yet. The host said that people had a right to know the reason why it took so long to release. Trump tried to respond to the host's question about his case by rising up another case of Clinton about deleting her secret e-mails without unknown reason. Trump said that he would release his tax return as soon as Clinton explain why she deleted 33.000 e-mails. Then the host questioned whether it is negotiable or not. Trump responded to him by showing disagreement by saying "it's not negotiable, no." and he asked Clinton to explain the reason why she deleted the e-mails, then he will release the tax return.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his responding. He wanted to do FTA with maximum efficiency. In doing the FTA, he expressed it baldly on record on his disagreement with the non-minimization of a face threat. He tried to show direct disagreement toward the host's following up regarding the issue. He tried to said that he would release his tax return if Clinton gave her explanation about deleting secrets e-mail, then it could be negotiable.

Data 2.8 & Data 2.9:

HOLT: “Your two — your two minutes expired, but I do want to follow up. Stop-and-frisk was ruled...”

TRUMP: “*No, you’re wrong...*”

HOLT: “The argument is that it’s a form of racial profiling.”

TRUMP: “*No, the argument is that we have to...*”

Context of Data:

The dialogue is stated in the third segment of the debate about race. The case was begun by the argument of Trump that the stop and frisk system worked very well in a place like Chicago and New York. It brought the crime rate down. Then the host, Lester, followed up the Trump statement that stop and frisk were ruled unconstitutional in New York because it largely singled out black and Hispanic man. Trump said that the argument was just a judge, which is a very against-police judge. Then the host gave another follow up that if the stop and frisk were applied in New York, it was a form of racial profiling because it was a largely black and Hispanic man. Trump tried to respond to it by saying that it would be taking the guns away from the people who have them and they shouldn’t have them.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his responding. He wanted to do FTA baldly on record with ignoring the face threat. Trump tried to defend himself by directly showing disagreement in his words “no, you’re wrong” and “no, the argument is that...” without minimizing the face threat. This strategy

happened in the situation that the speaker and the hearer were in a close relationship. But in this context, the situation indicated that the speaker wanted to be closer to the hearer.

Data 2.10:

TRUMP: *“I’d like to respond to that.”*

HOLT: *“Please.”*

Context of Data:

The dialogue above was stated in the second segment of the debate about race with the issue of implicit bias done by the police. In this case, Clinton had a first turn to give her argument about the issue. By the end of Clinton’s turn, Trump asked the host for a chance to respond to her by saying *“I’d like to respond to that.”* This sentence is considered as a requesting indirect way.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used the bald-on record strategy in his responding. He wanted to do FTA with the maximum efficiency so satisfy the hearer. He expressed a requesting in doing FTA with non-minimization of a face threat. He tried to express his idea to respond to Clinton’s argument. He tried to show his competence to give a better idea by asking a chance to respond.

Data 2.11:

TRUMP: “*I’d like to just respond if I might.*”

HOLT: “Please — 20 seconds.”

TRUMP: “*I’d just like to respond.*”

HOLT: “Please respond, then I’ve got a quick follow-up for you.”

Context of Data:

The dialogue was stated in the second segment of the debate talking about race. In this case, Trump tried to respond to Clinton’s argument about the African-American community. Trump asked for time to give respond before it moved to another topic discussion. Trump directly said “I’d like to just respond if I might” and “I’d just like to respond” which is considered as a requesting. Then, the host followed up Trump’s request and gave him a chance to respond in 20 seconds.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his responding. He wanted to do FTA with maximum efficiency. In doing the FTA, he expressed it baldly on record on his requesting with minimizing the face threat. He tried to express his idea that what Clinton said was need to be responded to. He asked for responding in his request by saying the words “if I might” in the last statement which was considered as minimization of a face threat.

Data 2.12:

TRUMP: “Lester, *one thing I’d like to say.*”

HOLT: “Very quickly. Twenty seconds”

Context of Data:

The dialogue above is stated in the third segment of the debate with the topic of defeating ISIS. In this case, Trump tried to ask for the chance to respond to Clinton’s statement. Trump expressed requesting in a more direct way, he said: “One thing I’d like to say.” The host gave him a chance for 20 seconds to express his idea.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his responding. He wanted to do FTA baldly on record with the action of minimizing the face threat. He tried to show his competence that what Clinton said was need to be responded to. He asked for time to respond to the argument. In this situation, Trump said the words “one thing I’d like to say” which was considered as minimizing the face threat since he wanted to be closer to the hearer.

Data 2.13:

“Nine million people — nine million people lost their jobs. Five million people lost their homes. And \$13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out. Now, we have come back from that abyss. And it has not been easy. So,

we're now on the precipice of having a potentially much better economy..."
(Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The statement above is stated by Hillary Clinton in the first segment of the debate with the topic of achieving the prosperity of America. In this case, Clinton tried to give a warning directly to all the audiences in her responding that America is in the precipice of having a potential economy.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy in her responding. She tried to do FTA without minimizing the face threat. She attempted to let the audiences know by giving a warning in his responding that the condition of America in the past was terrible when 9 million people lost their jobs, five million people lost their home and 13 trillion dollars in family wealth was wiped out. In this situation, the speaker conveyed that she did care about the hearer and it caused that no redress was required.

Data 2.14:

"Our energy policies are a disaster. Our country is losing so much in terms of energy, in terms of paying off our debt. You can't do what you're looking to do with \$20 trillion in debt." (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is stated in the first segment of the debate talking about potential energy. In this case, Trump gave a warning that the energy policies in America are a disaster in his responding. He also mentioned that America had at least 20 trillion dollars in debt.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his responding. He wanted to do FTA with maximum efficiency without minimizing the face threat. He directly let the audiences know that America lost so much in terms of energy and paying off the debt. He did not minimize the threat to express the warning in which he used a direct way of uttering the warning in his responding. The situation indicated that the speaker did care about the hearer so much and for this reason, the redress was not required.

Data 2.15:

“Our country is suffering because people like Secretary Clinton have made such bad decisions in terms of our jobs and in terms of what’s going on.”
(Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The sentence is stated in the first segment of the debate with the issue of achieving prosperity. Trump tried to respond to what Clinton said in her argument about the issue.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his responding. He tried to do FTA baldly on record without minimizing the face threat. He gave a direct warning and let the hearer know that America is suffering because people like Clinton have made bad decisions in his responding. In this situation, the speaker conveyed that he did care about the hearer so that no redress was required.

Data 2.16:

“We’ve been working with them for many years, and *we have the greatest mess anyone’s ever seen*. You look at the Middle East, it’s a total mess. Under your direction, to a large extent.” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered by Donald Trump in the second segment of the debate with the topic of preventing homegrown attacks by an American citizen. In this case, Trump talked about cooperating with middle east nations in which it was the bad cooperation in his opinion. He gave a warning in working with them by mentioning the record in the past that it was a total mess. He showed to the audiences that working with the middle east was a bad idea, but under Clinton’s direction, it would be more terrible.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his responding. He wanted to do FTA with the maximum efficiency to satisfy the hearer's face. In doing the FTA, he expressed the warning without minimizing the face threat. He expressed the warning directly that America had such a situation. This is indicating that the speaker did care about the hearer so that the hearer did not need to do any redressive action.

Data 2.17:

“And, in fact, his cavalier attitude about nuclear weapons is *so deeply troubling*. That is the number-one threat we face in the world. And it becomes particularly threatening if terrorists ever get their hands on any nuclear material.” (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered by Clinton in the third segment of the debate with the issue of a nuclear weapon. In this case, Clinton directly expressed warning to the audiences toward Trump's temperament. She said that Trump's cavalier attitude about nuclear weapons is so deeply troubling.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy in her response. She tried to do FTA with maximum efficiency without minimizing the face threat. She tried to explain to the hearer that the country would face the number one threat if it

happened and that would be a very bad situation. She did not minimize any threat in her judgment about Trump as it was a direct warning. In this situation, she conveyed that she did care about the audience regarding the issue and so that, the redress was not required anymore.

Data 2.18:

“Nuclear is the single greatest threat. Just to go down the list, we defend Japan, we defend Germany, we defend South Korea, we defend Saudi Arabia, we defend countries. They do not pay us. But they should be paying us because we are providing tremendous service and we’re losing a fortune.”
(Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The argument above is stated in the third segment of the debate with the topic of nuclear weapons. In this case, Trump mentioned that the greatest threat in America is nuclear. This statement was a kind of warning since it explained to the audiences that America has a problem with nuclear, Trump said that America has defended some countries but they did not pay the fair share and they should be paying it.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his response. He wanted to do FTA with the maximum efficiency to satisfy the hearer’s face. In doing the FTA, he did not minimize the face threat, then it would be a direct

warning. He let the hearer know that the greatest threat that America faced was nuclear. In this situation, he tried to care about the hearer, so that the redressive action of the hearer was not required.

Data 2.19:

“So, if you want to see in real-time what the facts are, please *go* and *take a look*. Because what I have proposed...” (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered by Clinton in the first segment of the debate with the topic of creating jobs for Americans. In this case, Clinton asked the hearer to visit the real-time fact-checker. This was a kind of imperative form since it contained a form of a command. She used the words “go” and “take a look” which were a base form of a verb and these expressed the imperative form.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy in her responding. She wanted to do FTA with maximum efficiency to satisfy the hearer’s face. She did not minimize the face threat in doing the FTA. In this situation, she gave direct orders or entreaties which was considered as imperatives, in which the speaker tried to implore the hearer to care for her.

Data 2.20:

“In fact, I have written a book about it. It’s called “Stronger Together.” *You can pick it up* tomorrow at a bookstore...” (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The utterance above is stated in the second segment of the debate with the issue of trade deals. In this case, Clinton asked Trump and all the audiences to look at what she proposed in her book entitled “Stronger Together”. She used the words “pick it up” to give a direct command in which it was considered an imperative form.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy in her responding. She tried to do FTA without minimizing the face threat since she wanted to do the FTA with the maximum efficiency. She tried to do the FTA baldly on record as it was indicated in her words of containing order or entreaties which was considered as imperatives. In this situation, she spoke as if imploring the hearer to care for her. Thereby, it was stressing her high valuation of the hearer’s relationship.

c) Interrupting**Data 3.1:**

TRUMP: “And now you want to approve Trans-Pacific Partnership. You were totally in favor of it. Then you heard what I was saying, how bad it is, and you said, I can’t win that debate. But you know that if you did win, you would approve that, and that will be almost as bad as NAFTA. Nothing will ever top NAFTA.”

CLINTON: “*Well, that is just not accurate.* I was against it once it was finally negotiated and the terms were laid out...”

Context of Data:

In the dialogue above, the statements are about American manufacturers. Trump said that Clinton will approve the Trans-Pacific partnership which is considered a bad deal. Clinton showed disagreement by saying “Well, that is just not accurate” to defend what Trump said about her. Clinton also gave the explanation that she was against the Trans-Pacific Partnership and negotiated it.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy in her interrupting. She wanted to do FTA with maximum efficiency to satisfy the hearer’s face. She minimized the face threat in doing the FTA implicitly. She expressed her implicit meaning in her disagreement since she would rather say “that is just not accurate” than saying “no” or another negation word. This strategy happened in the situation that the speaker and the hearer were in a close relationship. But in this context, the situation indicated that the speaker wanted to be closer to the hearer.

Data 3.2:

CLINTON: “Well, it’s also fair to say, if we’re going to talk about mayors, that under the current mayor, crime has continued to drop, including murders. So, there is...”

TRUMP: “*No, you’re wrong. You’re wrong.*”

CLINTON: “*No, I’m not.*”

TRUMP: “Murders are up. All right, you check it.”

Context of Data:

The dialogue was stated in the second segment of the debate about race. In this case, Clinton stated that under the current mayor, crime has continued to drop, including murders. Trump interrupted Clinton’s argument by saying “No, you’re wrong. You’re wrong.” Then, Clinton tried to maintain her argument and rejected Trump’s judge by saying disagreement “No, I’m not.” Trump was persistent toward his argument and maintain that by giving the fact that murders are up.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his interrupting. He tried to do FTA with maximum efficiency to satisfy the hearer’s face. He did not minimize the face threat in doing the FTA. He directly said the word “No, you’re wrong” to do the FTA with ignoring Clinton’s face. In this situation, bald on record strategy was applied in a close relationship since the speaker and the hearer did not minimize the face threat.

Data 3.3:

“You are going to approve one of the biggest tax cuts in history. You are going to approve one of the biggest tax increases in history. You are going to drive business out. *Your regulations are a disaster*, and you’re going to increase regulations all over the place.” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement is uttered in the first segment of the debate talking about taxes. In this case, Trump interrupted Clinton's argument when she was given her two minutes to express her idea about her plan to cut the tax. Trump gave a warning toward Clinton's plan that her regulations are a disaster.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his interrupting. He wanted to do FTA baldly on record without minimizing the face threat. In his warning, he directly let the audiences know that a big tax cut would drive out the business, and the worst is that the regulations will be applied all over the place in America. In this situation, the relationship was a kind of close relationship since he did care toward the hearer.

Data 3.4:

“That’s a — that’s — *go* to the — please, fact-checkers, *get* to work.”
(Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The sentence above is stated in the first segment of the debate talking about ISIS. In this case, Clinton interrupted Trump in his chance of expressing argument and asked him to take a look at the facts in the fact-checker regarding

Trump's judgment. She expressed an imperative form since she used the word “go to the fact-checker” as a command.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy in her interrupting. She tried to do FTA with the maximum efficiency with non-minimization of the face threat. She used the word “go” which was considered as imperatives since she wanted to implore the hearer to care for her. In this situation, bald on record strategy was applied in a close relationship.

d) Overlapping

Data 4.1:

“I did not. I did not. *I do not* say that.” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above was uttered by Donald Trump in his statement regarding Clinton’s argument about him in the first segment of debate by the issue of creating jobs for Americans. In this case, Clinton said that some country is going to be the clean- energy superpower of the 21st century. Clinton said that Trump thought that climate change is a hoax perpetrated by Chinese, but Clinton said that it was real. From Clinton’s statement, Trump tried to show disagreement and overlapping has happened.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his overlapping. He wanted to do FTA with maximum efficiency without minimizing the face threat. He expressed disagreement toward what Clinton judge about him by saying “I do not say that”. In this situation, bald on record strategy happened in a close relationship since the participants did not minimize the face threat.

Data 4.2:

TRUMP: “But you haven’t done it in 30 years or 26 years or any number you want to...”

CLINTON: “*And I have done a lot...*”

TRUMP: “Your husband signed NAFTA, which was one of the worst things that ever happened to the manufacturing industry.”

CLINTON: “*Well, that’s your opinion. That is your opinion.*”

Context of Data:

In the dialogue above, the statements are in the first segment of debate about creating jobs for Americans. Trump said that Clinton hasn’t done any solution to creating more jobs for Americans in 30 years. But Clinton disagreed with the Trump statement by saying “I have done a lot”. Then, Trump delivered another argument about NAFTA which was one of the worst things that ever happened in the manufacturing industry. Clinton responded it by showing her disagreement by saying “that is your opinion.”

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy in her overlapping. She tried to do FTA with maximum efficiency to satisfy the hearer's face. In doing the FTA, she performed it by minimizing the face threat by implication. She implicitly said, "that's your opinion" to perform disagreement. In this situation, she applied bald on record strategy to make the relationship closer to the hearer.

Data 4.3:

"HOLT: Let me get you to pause right there because we're going to move into — we're going to move into the next segment. We're going to talk taxes..."

CLINTON: *That can't — that can't be left to stand.*"

Context of Data:

The dialogue above is stated at the end of the first segment about creating jobs for Americans. The host Lester wanted to bring the candidates into the next segment about taxes. However, Clinton overlapped the host utterance because she thought that the discussion in this first segment was not clear enough. She thought that there were some ideas that were not covered yet. Clinton showed her disagreements to jump into the next segment by saying "that can't be left to stand." Then, the host, eventually gave Clinton to express her idea in the last 30 seconds and then the first segment would be done.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record in her overlapping. She wanted to do FTA with maximum efficiency. In doing the FTA, she minimized the face threat implicitly. She tried to show her disagreement by saying “that can’t be left to stand”. In this situation, bald on record strategy applied in the relationship that the speaker wanted to be closer to the hearer.

Data 4.4:

“TRUMP: No, no, you’re telling the enemy everything you want to do.

CLINTON: *No, we’re not. No, we’re not.*”

Context of Data:

The dialogue above is stated at the end of the first segment. The case is started by the statement delivered by Clinton that she recommended the audiences to take a look at her website to know the fact-checker and what Clinton planned to lead America in the future. Trump mentioned the example that Clinton put her plan on how to defeat ISIS. Trump tried to attack Clinton by giving the argument that the way she put what she planned on her website, was similar to telling the enemy what she wanted to do. Then, Clinton tried to maintain her argument and overlapped Trump’s statement by showing disagreement by saying “no, we’re not.”

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used bald on record strategy in her overlapping. She tried to do FTA baldly on record with the maximum efficiency to satisfy the hearer's face. In doing the FTA, she used non-minimization since she did not minimize the face threat. She directly expressed her disagreement with Trump's judgment about her. In this situation, bald on record happened in a close relationship since the participants did not minimize the face threat.

Data 4.5:

“CLINTON: And when we talk about your business, you've taken business bankruptcy six times...

TRUMP: *Wrong. Wrong.*”

Context of Data:

The dialogue above was stated in the second segment of the debate about taxes. Clinton tried to attack Trump by mentioning his failures as a businessman. She said that Trump has taken business bankruptcy six times, then Trump called himself king of debt, and there were a lot of great businesspeople that have never taken bankruptcy once. Clinton thought that there was not a direct transfer of skills from business to government, sometimes what happened in business would be really bad for the government. In this case, Trump overlapped Clinton's statement

and tried to maintain himself by showing disagreement by saying “wrong, wrong.”

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his overlapping. He wanted to do FTA baldly on record without minimizing the face threat. He directly expressed his disagreement toward Clinton’s judgment about him by saying the word “wrong, wrong”. In this situation, bald on record strategy was applied in the close relationship of the participants.

Data 4.6:

CLINTON: “Well, I hope the fact-checkers are turning up the volume and really working hard. Donald supported the invasion of Iraq.”

TRUMP: “Wrong.”

CLINTON: “That is absolutely proved over and over again.”

TRUMP: “*Wrong. Wrong.*”

Context of Data:

The dialogue was stated in the third segment of the debate talking about ISIS. In this case, Clinton said that Trump has supported the invasion of Iraq. Trump overlapped Clinton’s statement by showing disagreement that he did not support the invasion. He said, “Wrong, wrong” to express his disagreement that he did not do that.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his overlapping. He wanted to do FTA with the maximum efficiency to satisfy the hearer's face. In doing the FTA, he did not minimize the face threat to the hearer. He expressed his disagreement in a direct way rather than using implication. He tried to convince Clinton that he did not do what was on Clinton's judgment, supporting the invasion. In this situation, bald on record strategy happened in a close relationship since the speaker did not minimize the face threat.

Data 4.7 & Data 4.8:

HOLT: "Mr. Trump, a lot of these are judgment questions. You had supported the war in Iraq before the invasion. What makes you..."

TRUMP: "*I did not* support the war in Iraq."

TRUMP: "Wait a minute. I was against the war in Iraq. Just so you put it out."

HOLT: "The record shows otherwise, but why — why was..."

TRUMP: "*The record does not show that.*"

Context of Data:

The dialogue above was stated in the third segment of the debate talking about ISIS. In this case, the host tried to follow up Clinton's statement that Trump supported the invasion of Iraq. The overlapping happened in this time between Trump and the host when Trump tried to maintain himself by saying "I did not support the war..." that considered as disagreement. The other statement that

contains disagreement is in the next part of the conversation that the host showed the record in which Trump took part in the invasion. Trump rejected the host judgment by showing disagreement by saying “The record does not show that.”

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his overlapping. He tried to do FTA with maximum efficiency without minimizing the face threat. In doing the FTA, he performed the FTA baldly on record with a direct disagreement reflected in his word “I did not...” and “the record does not show that”. He did not use implication since the minimization of face threat was ignored here. The relationship in this kind of situation was a close relationship since the speaker would directly deliver the speaker’s wants.

Data 4.9:

CLINTON: “...He has said repeatedly that he didn’t care if other nations got nuclear weapons, Japan, South Korea, even Saudi Arabia...”

TRUMP: “*Wrong. It’s lies.*”

Context of Data:

The dialogue was stated in the third segment of the debate that talking about the nuclear weapon issue. In this case, Clinton said the worst part of Trump’s temperament is that Trump repeatedly said that he did not care if other nations got a nuclear weapon. Trump tried to defend himself by showing

disagreement with the word “Wrong, it’s lies” and overlapping happened in this session.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his overlapping. He performed FTA baldly on record with the maximum efficiency. In doing the FTA, he did not minimize the face threat to the hearer. The direct disagreement was expressed in performing the strategy. The purpose was Trump wanted to convince Clinton that he was not like what she said in her judgment. In this situation, the relationship between the speaker and the hearer became close since there was no minimization of the face threat.

Data 4.10:

CLINTON: “And, in fact, his cavalier attitude about nuclear weapons is so deeply troubling. That is the number-one threat we face in the world.”

TRUMP: “*It’s not an accurate one at all. It’s not an accurate one....*”

Context of Data:

The dialogue was another line of the previous data. This was stated in the third segment of the debate talking about nuclear weapon issues. In this case, Clinton said that, in fact, Trump has a cavalier attitude toward a nuclear weapon and this is the number-one threat faced in the world. Trump rejected her judgment

about him by saying “It’s not an accurate one at all” which was considered as disagreement.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his overlapping statement. He wanted to do FTA baldly on record with the action of minimizing face threat. An implication would be expressed to minimize the threat. He used implicit words rather be than a direct way to express his disagreement toward Clinton’s judgment. The situation would be the speaker wanted to be closer to the hearer.

Data 4.11:

CLINTON: “You know, he tried to switch from looks to stamina. But this is a man who has called women pigs, slobs and dogs, and someone who has said pregnancy is an inconvenience to employers, who has said...”

TRUMP: “*I never said that. I didn’t say that.*”

Context of Data:

The dialogue was a part of the last topic of the debate which is talking about a president look. In this case, one question was addressed by the host to Trump about what he said in his quote that Clinton doesn’t have a presidential look. Trump started talking about her look and her stamina in which it was not enough to be the president. Clinton responded to Trump’s statement and tried to attack him by saying that Trump is a kind of man who called women pigs, slobs,

and dogs, and someone who said that pregnancy is an inconvenience to employers. Trump rejected Clinton's judgment by saying "I never said that. I didn't say that." This is considered part of the disagreement.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his overlapping. He tried to do FTA with maximum efficiency without minimizing the face threat. In doing the FTA, he performed the FTA baldly on record with a direct disagreement reflected in his word "I never say that" and "I didn't say that". He did not use implication since the minimization of face threat was ignored here. The relationship in this kind of situation was a close relationship since the speaker would directly deliver the speaker's wants.

Data 4.12:

"Murders are up. All right. *You check it.*" (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement is uttered in the second segment of the debate with the issue of race. In this case, Trump asked Clinton directly to check the number of murders whether it was increased or not. The use of words "you check it" was considered an imperative form since it indicated a kind of command.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his overlapping statement. He tried to do FTA with the maximum efficiency with non-minimization of the face threat. He used the word “go” which was considered as imperatives since he wanted to implore the hearer to care for him. In this situation, bald on record strategy was applied in a close relationship.

Data 4.13:

“I think I should — *you go to* her website, and *you take a look* at her website. And *look at* her website. You know what? It’s no different than this. She’s telling us how to fight ISIS. Just *go to* her website. She tells you how to fight ISIS on her website.” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the second segment of the debate with the issue of defeating ISIS. In this case, it was actually Clinton’s statement which was repeated by Trump from the previous conversation. The words “go-to” and “take a look” were considered as imperative forms since they were indicated a direct command to the hearer.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his overlapping statement. He tried to do FTA without minimizing the face threat since she wanted to do the FTA with the maximum efficiency. He tried to do the FTA

baldly on record as it was indicated in her words of containing order or entreaties which was considered as imperatives. In this situation, he spoke as if imploring the hearer to care for him. Thereby, it was stressing her high valuation of the hearer's relationship.

2. Positive Politeness Strategies

a) Giving Arguments

Data 1.1:

“First of all, *I agree*, and a lot of people even within my own party want to give certain rights to people on watch lists and no-fly lists. *I agree* with you.”
(Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The sentence above is stated in the second segment of the debate with the topic of implicit bias by police. In this case, Trump had the same idea as Clinton that people on watch lists and no-fly lists have a certain right to be respected and to be helped for those who should not be on the lists. Trump applied seeking agreement by saying the words “I agree” contained in his statement.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used a positive politeness strategy in expressing his idea. He tried to redress directed to the addressee's positive face that the hearer's wants should be thought of as desirable. He tried to seek ways in which it is

possible to agree with her such as indicated in his words “I agree...”. Trump stressed his agreement with Clinton to satisfy her desire to be right.

Data 1.2:

“As far as the cyber, *I agree* to parts of what Secretary Clinton said.” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The sentence above is stated in the third segment of the debate with the topic of cyber-attack. In this case, Trump had the same idea as what Clinton’s proposed about cyber-attack in America. Trump expressed agreement toward Clinton’s statement by saying the word “I agree”.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used a positive politeness strategy in expressing his idea.

He tried to redress directed to the addressee’s positive face that the hearer’s wants should be thought of as desirable. He tried to seek ways in which it is possible to agree with her such as indicated in his words “I agree...”. Trump stressed his agreement with Clinton to satisfy her desire to be corroborated in her opinion.

Data 1.3 & Data 1.4:

“Well, I support our democracy. And sometimes you win, sometimes you lose. *But I certainly will support* the outcome of this election.” (Hillary Clinton)

“The answer is, if she wins, *I will absolutely support her.*” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The two statements above are uttered in the last part of the debate. in this case, the host gave a question to both Trump and Clinton in the last segment as the final question. The question was whether two of them would accept the outcome of the election or not. Both Clinton and Trump expressed a promise in their answer. Clinton used the words “I certainly will support the outcome” while Trump used the words “I will absolutely support her” in which that were considered as indicating a promise.

Analysis:

In this case, both Clinton and Trump used a positive politeness strategy in expressing their idea. They wanted to satisfy the hearer’s positive face by claiming that whatever the hearer wants, they, as the speaker, would help to obtain. The use of the word “will” was considered as a promise which is the outcome of a positive politeness strategy.

Data 1.5:

“Finally, *we* tonight are on the stage together, *Donald Trump and I*. Donald, it’s good to be with you. *We’re* going to have a debate where *we* are talking about the important issues facing our country.” (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered by Hillary Clinton in the opening of the debate. In this case, Clinton greeted the audiences and her rival Trump before moving to the more important topic of debate. Clinton used the word “we” here to include both herself and Trump in the same activity, it was debated. In the next statement, she used “we’re going to” and “we’re talking” to show that Clinton as the speaker and Trump as the hearer were in the same activity.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used a positive politeness strategy in expressing her statement. She wanted to redress directed to the addressee’s positive face. She used the form of the inclusive word “we” to perform cooperative assumptions and thereby redress the FTA. She used the word “we” to include herself and Trump in the activity.

Data 1.6:

“I think *Hillary and I* agree on that. *We* probably disagree a little bit as to numbers and amounts and what *we’re* going to do, but perhaps *we’ll* be talking about that later.”

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the first segment of the debate. In this case, Trump stated that he thought Hillary and him agree on what he proposed, they probably disagree a little bit as to number and amounts. Trump used the word “we” to reflect himself and Clinton as the speaker and hearer including in the same activity.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used a positive politeness strategy in expressing his statement. He wanted to redress directed to the addressee’s positive face. He used the form of the inclusive word “we” to perform cooperative assumptions and thereby redress the FTA. She used the word “we” to include himself and Clinton in the same activity.

Data 1.7:

Host: “Mr. Trump, for five years, you perpetuated a false claim that the nation’s first black president was not a natural-born citizen. You questioned his legitimacy. In the last couple of weeks, you acknowledged what most Americans have accepted for years: The president was born in the United States. Can you tell us what took you so long?”

Trup: “*Because* I want to get on to defeating ISIS *because* I want to get on to creating jobs *because* I want to get on to having a strong border, *because* I want to get on to things that are very important to me and that are very important to the country.”

Context of Data:

The statement above is stated in the third segment of the debate with the topic of defeating ISIS. In this case, Trump stated in his argument that he gave reasons on what he wanted to do, it was indicated by the word “because”. He wanted to defeat ISIS, he wanted to create jobs, he wanted to have a strong border, he wanted to get on everything that was very important to him and his country.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used positive politeness strategies in expressing his idea. He wanted to redress directed to the addressee’s positive face. He gave practical reasoning as to why he wanted or what he wanted in order for the hearer led to see the reasonableness of the FTA. The use of the word “because” here was indicated in the form of giving a reason. In other words, it is a way of implying the cooperative assumption that is showing what helped is needed. He tried to get on defeating ISIS in which that was the most crucial problem faced by America. He actually had the same target as Clinton’s proposed to solve the problem of defeating ISIS.

b) Replying

Data 2.1:

“You need better relationships. *I agree* with Secretary Clinton on this.”
(Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the second segment of the debate with the topic of race. In this case, Trump expressed the same idea as Clinton's argument that America needs better relationships. The use of the words "I agree" here indicated the form of seeking agreement.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used a positive politeness strategy in his responding. He tried to redress directed to the addressee's positive face that the hearer's wants should be thought of as desirable. He tried to seek ways in which it is possible to agree with her such as indicated in his words "I agree...". Trump stressed his agreement with Clinton to satisfy her desire to be right.

Data 2.2 & Data 2.3:

"Well, I told you, *I will release* them as soon as the audit." (Donald Trump)

"*I will release* my tax returns — against my lawyer's wishes — when she releases her 33,000 e-mails that have been deleted. As soon as she releases them, *I will release*." (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The utterances above are stated in the first segment of the debate with the topic of taxes. In this case, Trump was asked by the host to explain his tax return

why it took so long to release. Trump responded that he would release as soon as the audit. He expressed promise in his words “I will release”

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used a positive politeness strategy in his responding. He wanted to satisfy the hearer’s positive face by claiming that whatever the hearer wants, he, as the speaker, would help to obtain. The use of the word “will” was considered as a promise which is the outcome of a positive politeness strategy.

Data 2.4:

“I will bring — excuse me. *I will bring back jobs*. You can’t bring back jobs.”
(Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the first segment of the debate with the topic of creating more jobs for American manufacturers. In this case, Trump said to Clinton in the last part of his argument that he would bring back jobs and she could not bring back. Trump used the words “I will bring back jobs” here to express a promise to all the audiences.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used a positive politeness strategy in his responding. He wanted to satisfy the hearer's positive face by claiming that whatever the hearer wants, he, as the speaker, would help to obtain. The use of the word "will" was considered as a promise which is the outcome of a positive politeness strategy.

Data 2.5:

"And *I believe strongly* that commonsense gun safety measures would assist us." (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the second segment of the debate with the topic of race. Clinton gave the argument regarding the issue of gunman and gangster in street in America. She said that commonsense gun safety measures would assist American people. She used the words "I believe strongly" in her statement in which indicated the expression of being optimistic.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used a positive politeness strategy in her responding statement. She tried redress directed to the addressee's positive face that her wants should be thought of as desirable. She expressed a presumptuous assumption that the hearer would cooperate with her wants. She put pressure on the hearer to

cooperate with her wants, in this case, she wanted that commonsense gun safety measure would assist people.

Data 2.6:

“I will bring — excuse me. *I will bring back jobs. You can’t bring back jobs.*”
(Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement is uttered in the first segment of the debate with the topic of taxes. In this case, Trump stated that he promised to bring back jobs to Americans. He said to Clinton that she could not bring back jobs. These arguments of Trump were considered as being optimistic since he believed himself would bring back jobs while Clinton could not.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used a positive politeness strategy in his responding statement. He tried redress directed to the addressee’s positive face that his wants should be thought of as desirable. He expressed a presumptuous assumption that the hearer would cooperate with his wants. He put pressure on the hearer to cooperate with his wants, in this case, he wanted that he would bring back jobs and Clinton could not do that.

c) Interrupting

Data 3.1:

CLINTON: "I do. You know, *I made a mistake using a private email.*"

TRUMP: "*That's for sure.*"

CLINTON: "And if I had to do it over again, I would, obviously, do it differently. But I'm not going to make any excuses. It was a mistake, and I take responsibility for that."

TRUMP: "*That was more than a mistake. That was done purposely.*"

Context of Data:

The dialogue above is stated in the first segment of the debate with the topic of taxes. In this case, Clinton said that she made a mistake using private e-mails. Trump approved her statement, firstly, in his words "that's for sure", then Trump stated the different ideas from what Clinton said first. He said "that was more than. That was done purposely" which was considered as avoiding disagreement in which he tried to agree in the first, but the rest of his statement was contrary.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his interrupting. He tried to redress directed to the hearer's positive face that his wants should be thought of as desirable. He expressed the desire to agree with Clinton to lead the mechanism of pretending to agree. The speaker performed avoiding disagreement since he would go in twisting his utterances so as to appear to agree or to hide

disagreement. He said that what Clinton did toward the e-mail was a mistake, but in the end, he said that was more than a mistake, that was done purposely.

d) Overlapping

Data 4.1:

CLINTON: “And I have — well, not quite that long. *I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s.* I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again...”

TRUMP: “*Well, he approved NAFTA...*”

CLINTON: “... million new jobs, a balanced budget...”

TRUMP: “*He approved NAFTA, which is the single worst trade deal ever approved in this country.*”

Context of Data:

The dialogue above is stated in the first segment of the debate with the topic of creating more jobs for Americans manufacturers. In this case, Clinton said that her husband did a good job in the 1990s which was created millions of new jobs and a balanced budget. Trump knew that what her husband did in the 1990s was approving NAFTA and Trump agree with the part of her statement. However, the rest of the Trump statement was totally contrary to Clinton’s idea, that Approving NAFTA was the worst trade deal ever approved in the country. Trump statement was considered as avoiding disagreement since he stated the agreement of what Clinton said in the first, by saying “well, he approved

NAFTA”, then, the rest of his idea was contrary with Clinton statement, with the words “he approved NAFTA, which is the single worst trade deal ever”.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used bald on record strategy in his overlapping. He tried to redress directed to the hearer’s positive face that his wants should be thought of as desirable. He expressed the desire to agree with Clinton to lead the mechanism of pretending to agree. The speaker performed avoiding disagreement since he would go in twisting his utterances so as to appear to agree or to hide disagreement. He tried to agree with Clinton first but saying the contrary at the end.

3. Negative Politeness Strategies

a) Giving Arguments

Data 1.1:

“I don’t think top-down works in America. I think building the middle class, investing in the middle class, making college debt-free so younger people can get their education, helping people refinance their — their debt from college at a lower rate.” (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The statement above is stated in the first segment of the debate with the topic of taxes. In this case, Clinton stated that building top-down did not work in America. She thought that building a middle-class society would be the best

choice in the country. The way Clinton expressed pessimistically was reflected in the words “I don’t think”, she did not believe that top-down would work in the country.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used a negative politeness strategy in expressing her idea. She redressed to the addressee’s negative face that she wants to have her freedom unhindered and her attention unimpeded. She explicitly expressed doubt that the condition for the appropriateness of her speech act obtains. The use of the word “I don’t think...” here was considered as the form of expressing doubt.

Data 1.2:

“Look, here’s the story. I want to make America great again. I’m going to be able to do it. *I don’t believe* Hillary will. The answer is, if she wins, I will absolutely support her.” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the last segment of the debate. In this case, Trump said that he would make America great again as time ago. He thought that Clinton could not do that as stated in his words “I don’t believe”. it reflected the expression of pessimistic performed by Trump.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used a negative politeness strategy in expressing her idea. He redressed to the addressee's negative face that he wants to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded. He explicitly expressed doubt that the condition for the appropriateness of his speech act obtains. The use of the word "I don't believe..." here was indicated the form of doubt performed by Trump.

Data 1.3:

"...because *politicians* like Secretary Clinton won't allow them to bring the money back..." (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The sentence above is stated in the first segment of the debate with the topic of taxes. In this case, Trump gave his argument about tax increase according to Clinton's plan. He said when a company brought billion dollars from oversea, they could not bring the money back because the country would not allow that since the tax was so onerous. Trump used the word "politician" which stated Clinton as a general rule. He wanted to minimize the impinge but the circumstance forced him, then he used this kind of strategy to minimize the FTA.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used a negative politeness strategy in expressing his idea. He tried to do FTA without impinging the hearer's face but he was merely forced by circumstances. So, he dissociated himself as the speaker and the hearer from the particular imposition in the FTA by stating some of the general social rules. The use of the word "politicians" here was a pronoun avoidance of the instance of this strategy.

b) Replying

Data 2.1:

"And if I had to do it over again, I would, obviously, do it differently. But I'm not going to make any excuses. It was a mistake, and *I take responsibility for that.*" (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The utterance above is stated in the first segment of the debate with the topic of taxes. In this case, Clinton asked for apologizing about what she had done. In the previous conversation, the issue of Clinton deleted 33.000 e-mail was rose up by Trump then it was followed up by the host. Clinton asked for apologizing because of using private e-mail. She used the words "I take responsibility for that" considered as a form of asking to apologize.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used negative politeness strategy in her responding. She redressed to the addressee's negative face that she wants to have her freedom of action unhindered and her attention unimpeded. She used an apology for doing FTA to indicate her reluctance to impinge on the hearer's negative face and partially redress the impingement. The use of words "I take responsibility" here was considered as apologizing to perform the negative politeness since she simply admitted that she was impinging on the hearer's face.

Data 2.2:

"And, Hillary, *I'd just* ask you this. You've been doing this for 30 years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now? For 30 years, you've been doing it, and now you're just starting to think of solutions." (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the first segment of the debate with the topic of creating more jobs for Americans. In this case, Trump asked Clinton why she started thinking of solutions after 30 years doing the research on the solar panels. Trump used the words "I'd just ask you" to minimize the imposition. The use of the word "just" indicated minimizing the threat that Trump performed in his statement.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used negative politeness strategy in his responding. He redressed to the addressee's negative face that he wants to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded. In his statement, he used the word "just" to perform a negative politeness strategy in which it was used to delimit the extent of FTA in minimizing the imposition.

Data 2.3:

"So, I *just* want to give a lot of things — and *just* to respond." (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the third segment of the debate with the topic of nuclear weapons. In this case, Trump stated that he wanted to give respond to what Clinton said about him. The way he said was considered as a kind of minimize the imposition since he used the word "just" in his statement to perform the minimizing the threat.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used negative politeness strategy in his responding. He redressed to the addressee's negative face that he wants to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded. In his statement, he used the word

“just” to perform a negative politeness strategy in which it was used to delimit the extent of FTA in minimizing the imposition.

Data 2.4:

“Typical *politician*. All talk, no action. Sounds good, doesn’t work. Never going to happen.” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the first segment of the debate with the topic of taxes. In this case, Trump stated a judgment about Clinton that America was suffering because people like Secretary Clinton have made such bad decisions. Trump called Clinton as a typical politician that talks only without doing any action, sounds good but does not work and never going to happen. Trump stated the words “politician” to describe Clinton as a general rule.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used negative politeness strategy in his responding. He tried to do FTA without impinging the hearer’s face but he was merely forced by circumstances. So, he dissociated himself as the speaker and the hearer from the particular imposition in the FTA by stating some of the general social rules. The use of the word “politicians” here was a pronoun avoidance of the instance of this strategy.

4. Off-Record Strategies

a) Giving Arguments

Data 1.1:

“And when these people are going to put *billions and billions* of dollars into companies...” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the first segment of the debate with the topic taxes. In this case, Trump stated that when many people would put their money into a company and the company would bring the money back from oversea, they could not bring them back because the country would not allow them. In this statement, Trump used the words “billions and billions of dollars” which was considered as performing overstating since he said more than necessary. Trump tried to do the FTA, but he wanted to avoid the responsibility for doing that, then he left it up to the addressee to decide how to interpret it.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used the off-record strategy in expressing his idea. In the off-record strategy, it is not possible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act. He wanted to do the FTA but he did not want to take responsibility for doing that. He said something that was more general indicated in his word “billions and billions” in which he conveyed what he wanted more

than necessary. So, the hearer must make some inference to recover what was in fact intended.

Data 1.2:

“I think maybe there’s a political reason why you can’t say it, but I really don’t believe — in New York City, stop-and-frisk, *we had 2,200 murders, and stop-and-frisk brought it down to 500 murders. Five hundred murders is a lot of murders. It’s hard to believe, 500 is like supposed to be good??*”
(Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is uttered in the second segment of the debate with the topic of implicit bias by the police. In this case, Trump talked about the stop-and-frisk system. Trump gave the fact that the stop and frisk system did not work well in New York City, there were 2.200 murders and the stop-and-frisk system brought it down to 500 murders. Trump thought that five hundred murders were still a high number of murders. In this statement, Trump performed being ironic by saying the opposite of what he means in the last part of his statement. What he meant was five hundred murders was still a lot, but he said the opposite in the form of the question “500 is like supposed to be good?”.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used the off-record strategy in expressing his idea. He wanted to do FTA but he did not want to take the responsibility for doing that, so

that, the exact interpretation would be needed by the hearer. In his statement, he performed the strategy of being ironic since he conveyed the opposite of what he meant in his statement indicated by his words “and stop-and-frisk brought it down to 500 murders” contrary to “Five hundred murders is a lot of murders.” By the end of his statement, he also performed the strategy of the rhetorical question since he wanted the hearers to provide them with the indicated information. The question “500 is like supposed to be good?” was a kind of rhetorical question since it had no intention of obtaining an answer.

Data 1.3:

“Lester, we have a trade deficit with all of the countries that we do business with, of almost \$800 billion a year. *You know what that is? That means, who’s negotiating these trade deals?*” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The utterance above is stated in the first segment of the debate with the topic of taxes and trade deal. In this case, Trump gave an explanation that what America did so badly and that was being ripped off by every single country in the world. He said America had a trade deficit of almost \$800 billion a year with all of the countries it dealt with. In the last part of his statement, Trump applied the use of the rhetorical question of “You know what that is? That means, who’s negotiating trade deals?”. He used the rhetorical question to refer to people who did such bad trade deals. He tried to do the threat but he did not want to take

responsibility for doing that. The meaning of his rhetorical question was based on the hearer interpretation.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used the off-record strategy in expressing his idea. He wanted to do FTA but he did not want to take the responsibility for doing that, so that, the exact interpretation would be needed by the hearer. In his statement, he performed the strategy of the rhetorical question since he wanted the hearers to provide them with the indicated information. The question “You know what that is? That means, who’s negotiating these trade deals?” was a kind of rhetorical question since it had no intention of obtaining an answer.

b) Replying

Data 2.1:

“But she spent *hundreds of millions* of dollars on negative ads on me,”
(Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is stated in the third segment of the debate talking about presidential look. In this case, Trump stated that Clinton attacked him by spending hundreds of millions of dollars on negative ads on him. He judged Clinton that she sent things that were not nice, untrue and misrepresentation about him. He stated that it was not nice and he did not deserve this. In this statement, Trump used the words “hundreds of millions of dollars” which was considered as performing overstating strategy since he used the word more than necessary. He

said the FTA and avoided the responsibility for modifying it, then he left it up to the hearer to interpret the meaning.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used the off-record strategy in his responding. In the off-record strategy, it is not possible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act. He wanted to do the FTA but he did not want to take responsibility for doing that. He said something that was more general indicated in his word “hundreds of millions” in which he conveyed what he wanted more than necessary. So, the hearer must make some inference to recover what was in fact intended.

Data 2.2:

“We are in a *big, fat, ugly bubble.*” (Donald Trump)

Context of Data:

The statement above is stated in the first segment of the debate with the topic of achieving prosperity. In this case, Trump stated that America was in such a condition which was the worst since the great depression. He said that America had the worst revival of an economy and the only thing that looked good was the stock market, but if the interest rates was raised even a little bit, it would be

crashing down. Trump described the condition of America as “a big, fat, ugly bubble” and it was considered as performing metaphor.

Analysis:

In this case, Trump used the off-record strategy in his responding. He wanted to do the FTA but he did not want to take the responsibility for doing that. In this statement, he performed the strategy of using metaphors which were indicated in his words “a big, fat, ugly bubble”. He manifested America in a bad thing like an ugly bubble which reflected the recent condition of America. He did not want to do FTA but the circumstances forced him. So, he minimized the threat and left the meaning of the threat to the hearer’s interpretation.

Data 2.3:

“Well, I hope *the fact-checkers are turning up the volume* and really working hard.” (Hillary Clinton)

Context of Data:

The utterance above is stated in the third segment of the debate with the topic of defeating ISIS. In this case, Clinton tried her argument toward Trump’s judgment about the bad deal she has done. Trump said that the way Clinton went out from Iraq was a disaster. He said when America went out Iraq, it was creating a vacuum and from that situation, ISIS was formed. He said that the primary

source income of ISIS was from oil and the way Clinton went out Iraq without taking the oil was terrible.

Analysis:

In this case, Clinton used the off-record strategy in her responding. In the off-record strategy, it is not possible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act. Clinton said in her statement that “I hope the fact-checkers are turning up the volume...” which was considered as performing the metaphorical expression since she manifested the fact-checker as a thing that could turn up the volume. She left the meaning to the hearer interpretation to minimize the threat and to avoid the responsibility for doing FTA.

B. Discussion

Based on the previous analysis, this section presents how politeness strategies are applied by Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton in the first presidential debate. The whole data which were analyzed in the previous section indicate that from the total of 77 data collected, bald on record strategy has the most frequently used by the candidates with the number of 48 times appeared in the 5 types of sub-strategies (suggestion, showing disagreement, requesting, warning and using imperative form). The other strategy of politeness is positive politeness appears with the number of 15 times in 6 types of sub-strategies (seeking agreement, avoiding disagreement, offer or promise, be optimistic, including S and H in the activity and give or ask for reasons). Negative politeness

strategy appears in the number of 7 times with 4 types of sub-strategies (be pessimistic, apologize, minimize the imposition and state the FTA as a general rule). The last strategy of politeness is off-record which is considered as the most rarely used in this first presidential debate, appears with the number of 7 times with 4 types of sub-strategies (overstating, being ironic, using rhetorical question and using a metaphor).

By the context of the debate point of view, the analysis shows that politeness strategies are used in some contexts of debate, these contexts consist of expressing the idea of an argument, responding or replying, interrupting and overlapping. The most frequent strategy of politeness which is used in the debate is the context of responding or replying with 33 times in 4 strategies, they are bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record. The other strategy appears in the context of expressing ideas or arguments with 25 times in 4 strategies, they are bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record strategy. The other one is used in the context of overlapping with 14 times in two strategies, they are bald on record and positive politeness strategy. And the rarest strategy appears in the context of interrupting with 5 times in two strategies of bald on record and positive politeness strategy.

However, there are some different results in the use of politeness strategy regarding each topic. The first previous study analyzed the politeness strategy used by the main characters in the “Transformer: Age of Extinction” movie. The result showed that there was four strategies appeared in the utterance stated by the main characters of the movie, bald on record, positive politeness, negative

politeness, and off record. The strategy which was mostly used by the main characters of the movie is bald on record strategy. The other previous study is analyzing politeness strategy used by the character “George Milton” in a novel entitled “Mice and Men”. The result of the study showed that there were four strategies appeared in the novel, bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record strategy. However, the most frequent strategy used in the novel was bald on record strategy. These two previous studies have the same result toward this study in which bald on record strategy is the most frequently used by Trump and Clinton in the debate. However, the most obvious difference of this study toward the previous studies is the type of strategy which is used by the participants of the debate. In this case, the type of disagreement has the biggest number of sub-strategies that appeared in the debate. The main reason is that there is a diversity of arguments expressed by the participants in the debate in which it causes a context-based situation. The politeness strategy is analyzed based on the context of the debate in which the participants are in a certain situation while they are performing the strategy.

The other previous study was conducted to cover the politeness strategy entitled “The Study of Politeness and Face in 2013 Presidential Election Candidates of Iran”. It is a quite similar study of analyzing politeness strategy used in the debate. The result showed that bald on record has the biggest number of strategies that appeared in the debate. However, the most obvious difference in this study from the previous study is the case of the language used in the debate. In this study, the debate used the American English language in which it is

different from the previous study which is using the Arabic language. The result might have some similarity of politeness strategy appeared, however, it also has some differences in a certain case considering that American and Iranian has different language and culture.

The participants of the first presidential debate between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton used politeness strategies in their performance. Based on the result of this study, they used all of politeness strategies in the debate. However, not all of sub-strategies are applied in their performance. The result of this study shows that bald-on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record strategies are used almost in all topics of debate. The topics are opening segment, gun safety measures, securing America, taking out ISIS, NATO and about Iran deal.

The participants of the debate mostly used bald-on record strategies in their utterance. Based on Brown and Levinson that the utterance can be said as bald-on record when the speaker has a powerful argument and non-cooperation with the hearer. This strategy is usually used in the urgent situation in which the priority of the utterance is clearly understandable. It relates to the first presidential debate that was official debate in which the time given for each participant was limited in all topics of the debate. That was the reason why bald-on record strategy was the most used strategy in the first presidential debate of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton.

CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter covers two sub-topics of the research, they are conclusion and suggestion. The conclusion will be drawn based on the findings and discussions above. Whereas, the suggestion will lead the further researcher in conducting research on the same fields.

A. Conclusion

Based on the analysis, bald on record is the most frequent strategy used in this presidential debate since it performs the message in the most direct and clear way to the hearer, and it might be the main reason why bald on record has the highest number of strategies. Since the context of the debate is expressing the idea and maintaining the argument, the type of showing disagreement has the closest correlation toward the context and it proves that this type is performed 16 times. The highest number of the entire types in which Trump performs it 12 times while Clinton performs it 4 times. On the other side, off-record is considered as the most rarely used politeness strategy in this first presidential debate. Off-record, strategy employs the speaker's want to do the threat without taking the responsibility for doing that and it needs the hearer's ability to interpret the actual meaning of the speaker. Since off record depends on the hearer's interpretation, this strategy does not have any relation to the context of the debate. It might be used once or two times or more as needed, since the debate needs the participants to express their idea or argument in a clear and simple way in order to be easily accepted by the hearer.

In conclusion, Trump and Clinton were both performing bald on record strategy as the most frequently used in the presidential debate. It indicates that both of them do an act baldly. They tried to manage their directive utterances in order to convey the message successfully and get their addresses to fulfill their wants. All of these strategies are used to minimize the FTA done by Trump and Clinton.

B. Suggestion

This study describes how politeness strategy used by Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton in the first presidential debate. This study contributes to improving and understanding language studies especially on politeness strategy connected to the recent phenomena in case of debate. Moreover, there are many interesting phenomena to be analyzed in which it might not be covered yet toward politeness strategy. The researcher gives some suggestions for the further researcher to conduct the study of politeness strategy with the matter of speech or debate in some languages all over the world. The other matter will be interesting to be analyzed toward politeness related to the newest phenomena, a certain environment that is not covered by linguistics yet, or any other contextual conversation. Finally, the researcher hopes for the further researcher to conduct the study to cover the interesting issue to improve on understanding the linguistics theoretically and practically.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, P and Levinson, Stephen C. 2000. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Print.
- Murliati, Yuni. (2013). *Politeness Strategies Used By George Milton In John Steinbeck's Of Mice And Men*. Thesis. Retrieved from: <https://www.google.co.id/>
- Winerta, Viollen. (2012). *An Analysis Of Politeness Strategies In Requesting Used In Real Human And Non-Human Conversation On "Avatar" Movie*. Retrieved from: <https://www.google.co.id/>
- Sapir, Edward. (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York. Harcourt, Brace. Reprint: Dover Book on Language, 2004.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Watts, Richard. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Soleimani, Hassan and Nouraei, Maliheh. (2016). *The Study of Politeness and Face in 2013 Presidential Election Candidates of Iran*. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6(5): 978-987.
- Hasmi, M. (2013). *A Pragmatics Analysis of Politeness Strategies Reflected In Nanny Mcphee Movie*. Unpublished Thesis. Yogyakarta: Study Program of English Language and Literature, English Education Department, Faculty of Language and Arts., Yogyakarta State University.
- Freely, Austin. J and David L. Steinberg. (2009). *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making*. Miami: Wadsworth Learning.
- Holmes, Janet. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics: Fourth Edition*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Mills, Sara. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Griffith, P. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburg University Press.
- Grundy, Peter. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics: Second Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Locher, Miriam and Watts, Richard. (2005). *Politeness Theory and Relational Work*. Journal of Politeness Research (1): 9-33.
- Jary, Mark. (1998). *Relevance Theory and The Communication of Politeness*. Journal of Pragmatics 30(1998): 1-19.
- Editors, Biography.com. (2016, December 1). Donald Trump Biography. Retrieved from: <http://www.biography.com/people/donald-trump-9511238>

Editors, Biography.com. (2016, December 1). Hillary Clinton Biography. Retrieved from: <http://www.biography.com/people/hillary-clinton-9251306>

Editors, Washingtonpost.com. (2016, December 1). The First Trump Clinton Presidential Debate Transcript. Retrieved from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/09/26/the-first-trump-clinton-presidential-debate-transcript-annotated/?utm_term=.ea1302e65c2

CURRICULUM VITAE



Hamzah Arribath was born in Bondowoso on October 16, 1994. He Graduated from Senior High School of An Nur Bululawang in 2012. During his study at the Senior High School, He participated OSIS as the member and joined several student's organizations. He started his higher education at the Department of English Literature, UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang and Finished in 2018. During his study at the university, he joined UKM Pagar Nusa and participated in several events.