An Analysis Of Politeness Strategies Used By Donald Trump And Hillary Clinton Presidential Debate 2016

Muhammad Hasyimsyah Batubara[1,*], Cut Dara Ilfa Rahila[2], Hamna Fitri[.3]

[1,2,3] IAIN Takengon, Aceh Tengah, Aceh, Indonesia
[1] muhammad.hasyimsyahbatubara@gmail.com*; [2] dara.rahila@gmail.com2;
[3] muhammad.hasyimsyahbatubara@gmail.com
*corresponding author

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT (10PT)

Politeness is usually related to speech acts done by the speaker, and this can be seen in everyday life when people are having a conversation. The conversation that we often see in video debate is a conversation that has the value of politeness. This research analyzes politeness introduced by Brown and Levinson in Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton's presidential debate 2016. This research used a qualitative approach with library research. The sources of data were primary and secondary data. The data were in source primary the form of utterances that contain politeness strategies. Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton's presidential debate 2016 script was the data source. Secondary data in this research is the politeness aspect related to the problem in this research. The collecting data techniques are reduction, display, verification, or drawing conclusion. The result of the analysis is bald on record (16), positive politeness (26), negative politeness (34), and off-record (10). So the total politeness that occurred in Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton's presidential debate in 2016 is 86. The dominant utterance varieties politeness in presidential debate 2016 is 34 negative politeness.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is the primary communication tool in human life, both individually and collectively. Language is an overflow of someone whose content contains an intention to convey to other people, or the listener who hears can understand what is intended by the speaker. Furthermore, the function of language is a means of communication between society members as a symbol of the voice produced by the person's vocal apparatus. Again, communication tools are deliberate as a means to intercommunicate or relate to other people.

The explanation above to express thoughts, opinions, feelings, and ideas through language cannot be separated from linguistic knowledge because linguistics is the scientific learning of language and concerning the analysis of the form, meaning, and context of language. According to Mayer, linguistics is multidisciplinary, specialized, and many disciplines are involved for expertise in learning a language (Charles, 2002). One of the studies in linguistics is the study or science of meaning in language or the relationship between signs and symbols. In discussing the relationship of signs and symbols in linguistic studies, there is a specific field called the realm of pragmatics.

Mey elucidates pragmatics as studying the conditions of people's language uses as society determines these (Mey, 2015). It means that pragmatics examines the conditions of using people's language, which is determined by the social context. The use of language is authentic or genuine, involving speakers and speech partners in certain usage situations regarding some issues. In pragmatic studies, there is a discussion of socially determined politeness. Of course, that does not mean that we should always be polite because sometimes we can be very rude to others (Wardhaugh, 2006). Being friendly, polite to others, and saving public self-image is a concept popularized by Brown and Levinson in their politeness theory (Cutting, 2002). It is usually related to speech acts performed by speakers.

Politeness is an exciting subject concerning how people express their feeling or thought. The subject brings some concepts in delivering communication among people. Similarly, politeness is a communication strategy where people consider several choices of different kinds like what they want to say, how they say it, and with whom they are speaking to make good communication. This strategy is essential for people to be applied in a conversation since it contributes to building social relationships.

The application of politeness strategies will be examined in the United States presidential election debate, the first presidential campaign debate in 2016 between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton about jobs, the economy, race, and security in the United States. This debate will be seen in how each candidate applies polite communication. An explanation of politeness is fundamental in communication. The investigator intends to arrange research entitled "analysis of politeness strategies used by Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton's presidential debate 2016" to understand politeness strategies better.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the one branch of linguistics, and it is the study of all aspects of language use (Thomas, 1995:2 in Batubara, 2020), or that studies language as a communication tool that involves how language users use and interpret words and discourse in certain situations. Words and utterances refer to morphemes and sentences used in certain situations, while situations refer to language and physical contexts (Varga, 2010). It means that pragmatics is the discussion of the conditions of people's language use because social background determines these conditions. Pragmatics focuses on using these tools in meaningful communication. As stated by Yule (1996, p. 3); Rowe and Diane (2016), pragmatics is the discussion and delve of the meaning of language in a particular context, namely the social context of language users. Furthermore, pragmatics is regarding the interlinkage of semantic lore with our knowledge of the world by looking at the context of use (Griffiths, 2006). Basically, pragmatics mainly studies the phenomenon of language use in social relations, especially the relationship between expressions and certain contexts and the context of language use (Shahsavari, Alimohammadi, & Rasekh, 2014).

On the report of Levinson (1983, pp. 21-24), pragmatics is as follows: a) pragmatics is the discussion of the relationship among language and context, which is the basis of language understanding. This implies that to interpret the meaning of one's language, speakers and interlocutors are not only required to know the meaning of words and grammatical relationships between words but also need to draw conclusions from hypotheses. b) pragmatics studies the capability of language wearer to match sentences

with the appropriate context. The second description emphasizes the worth of compatibility among the sentences spoken by people who use the language and the available context.

2.2 Politeness

According to Holmes (1995); Lakoff (1975); Sifianou (1992), politeness is a deportment that occurs in the community, with the aim that they honor each other and degrade the possibility of conflicts or disputes amongst members of the community. In addition, according to Watts (2003), the emergence of politeness as a communication strategy not only avoids the possibility of conflict or differences in society but also develops good relations between community members. For Yule (1996), it is used to express other people's facial cognitions that occur in interactions between interlocutors. In addition, Goffman (1955) states that a positive public image formed by a person in his public interactions is defined as a face. This politeness can be in the form of praise, honor, or self-respect. At the same time, conceptualize the face as the impression that people need freedom and respect in certain aspects (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Therefore, this shows that everyone tends to maintain the image of each other in public so as not to be offended or disturbed by others. In addition, Brown & Levinson (1988) divides politeness strategies into four parts, namely record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and non-record.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Steps of Research

Some steps of the research in this study were as 1) Pick descriptions of the required materials from available sources. 2) Check the index containing the topic and variable of the problem being studied. 3) The next thing that becomes more typical is looking for books, articles, and biographies that are very helpful to get the materials that are relevant to the problem being studied. 4) Choose a video debate that will be the source of data in research analyzed by the researcher. The researcher choosing video debate is " DT and HC presidential debate 2016". 5) Watching and understanding the video. In this step, the researcher watches the video not only once for the purpose of understanding deeply about the dialog in the video and identifying out all the words, phrases, and sentences containing politeness as the data. After watching and understanding the conversation of video debate, the researcher identified or found all words, sentences, and phrases contained politeness as the data. 6) After the relevant information is found, the researcher then "reviews" and organizes the literature in order of importance to the problem under study. 7) In the last action, the procedure of writing a study from the sources that have been collected is carried out so that a single unit is built based on the research concept.

3.2 Research Method

The method is the important thing to find out the best result in doing this research, and it is arranged in a qualitative design. Subroto (1992); Bogdan and Biklen (1992:30); Sugiyono (2005) in Batubara (2020) stated that qualitative is descriptive. The qualitative design uses a library research approach at this moment. Library research is a mode of data collection by implementing a study of books, literature, records, and reports appertain to problems solved (Nazir, 2003). According to Zed (2008), in literature research, library searching is more than merely serving the mentioned functions for obtaining research data. Assertively library research limits its activities to library materials only without the need

for field research. This research got from inside the "DT and HC presidential debate 2016" that has a relationship with the research that will be done.

3.3 Source of The Data

The data in this is something important in the research. Arikunto (2006) mentioned: the source of data is the subject from which the data can be gotten. According to Arikunto's (2006) opinion, that source of data is the very important thing to mention. The data source in this research was arranged depending on using primer data and secondary data. Based on the explanation above, can be concluded such as the following: a) Primary data sources, namely data obtained directly from the research subject as a source of information sought. This data is also called first-hand data or direct data relating to research objects. Primary data in this research is the " DT and HC presidential debate 2016" script. b) The secondary data source is data obtained through other parties, not directly obtained by researchers from research subjects. Secondary data in this research is the politeness aspect that has a relationship with the problem in this research. In the study, the researcher only described any information that was found during the research. The secondary data is the video debate "DT and HC presidential debate 2016".

3.4 Technique of Data Analysis

The data analysis technique used Miles and Huberman's model, which are data display, data reduction, and conclusion drawing and verification (Miles and Huberman, 2005).

4. FINDINGS

In analyzing the data of this researcher, there are some steps that researcher had been done, but simpler in this researcher for analyzing the result researcher used some steps as the alike explanation in the previous chapter. In this section, the researcher describing each finding contains the politeness analysis found in the DT and HC presidential debate 2016, which includes bald of record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record in politeness. The description can be seen as follows:

4.1 Bald of Record

In data reduction, firstly, the researcher chooses the data needed for the result of this research and concentrates on the difficulties and purpose of this research. It was about bald on record of politeness in "DT and HC presidential debate 2016". Because for collecting the data researcher has finished finding the general data. Based on the explanation of the table, the researcher found the expression of politeness utterance. From the explanation above, that is in DT and HC presidential debate 2016 can found 13 expressing of bald on record in the debate.

Table 1. Sum of Bald on Record Politeness

No	Situation Use	Sum of Utterance in Bald on Record Politeness Strategy
1	Maxim of quality	7
2	Maxim of quaentity	2
3	Maxim or relevance	1
4	Maxim of manner	3

From the data above, it is clear that the utterance politeness in bald on record still has different. The chart above is shown how many utterances of politeness in bald on record. On the other hand, the mark that makes in the above chart why a kind of politeness. Moreover, from the result of politeness, the researcher analyzes them by DT and HC presidential debate 2016.

4.2 Positive Politeness

In data reduction, the researcher chooses the data of positive politeness needed for the result and the purpose of this research. It was about positive politeness in DT and HC presidential debate 2016. Because for collecting data, the researcher has finished finding the general data. Based on the explanation of the table below, the researcher found the expression of politeness utterance. From the explanation above, that is in DT and HC presidential debate 2016 can found 24 expressing of negative politeness in the debate.

Table 2. Sum of Positive Politeness

No	Situation of Use	Sum of Utterance in Positive Politeness Strategy
1	Notice, Attend to H	1
2	Exaggerate	4
3	Intensify Interest to H	2
4	Use In-Group Identity Markers	2
5	Seek Agreement	2
6	Presuppose/Raise/Assert Common Ground	2
7	Joke	3
8	Assert or Presuppose S's knowledge of and Concern for H's wants	1
9	Offer, Promise	1
10	Be Optimistic	1
11	Include Both S and H in the Activity	3
12	Give (or ask for) Reasons	1
13	Give Gifts to H	1

From the data above, it is clear that the utterance politeness in positive politeness is still had different. The chart above is shown how many utterances of politeness are in positive politeness. On the other hand, the mark that makes in the above chart why the kind of politeness. Moreover, from the politeness result, the researcher analyzes them using debate DT and HC presidential debate 2016.

4.3 Negative Politeness

In the data reduction, the researcher chooses the data of negative politeness needed for the result and the purpose of this research. It was about negative politeness in DT and HC presidential debate 2016. Because for collecting data, the researcher has finished finding the general data. Based on the explanation of the table below, the researcher found the expression of politeness utterance. From the explanation below, that is in Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton Presidential Debate 2016 can found 31 expressing negative politeness the debate.

.

Table 3. Sum of Negative Politeness

No	Situation of Use	Sum of Utterance In Negative Politeness Strategy
1	Be Conventionally Indirect	4
2	Question, Hedge	1
3	Be Pessimistic	8
4	Minimize the Imposition	8
6	Apologize	2
7	Impersonalize S and H	1
8	State the FTA as a General Rule	3
9	Nominalize	2
10	Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not Indebting H	2

From the data above, it is clear that the utterance politeness in bald on record still has different. The table above is shown how many utterances of politeness are in bold of record. On the other hand, the mark that makes in the above chart why a kind of politeness. Moreover, from the result of politeness, researchers analyze them by using debate DT and HC presidential debate 2016.

4.4 Off-Record

In data reduction, the researcher chooses the data off-record needed for the result and the purpose of this research. It was about off-record in DT and HC presidential debate 2016. Because for collecting data, the researcher has finished finding the general data. Based on the explanation of the table, the researcher also found the expression of politeness. From the explanation above in the DT and HC presidential debate 2016, the researcher found 10 expressing of off-record in the debate.

Table 4. Sum of Off Record Politeness

No	Situation of Use	Sum of Utterance In Positive Politeness Strategy
1	Give Hints	1
2	Give Association Clues	2
3	Presuppose	3
4	Understate	2
5	Use Contradiction	1
6	Be Ironic	1

4.5 Dominant Varieties Politeness That is Used in the Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton Presidential Debate 2016

From the analysis, the researcher concluded that the dominant utterance varieties politeness in DT and HC presidential debate 2016 negative politeness where in this debate the researcher found 31 utterances includes expressing politeness. Below is the data are taken from the debate of the DT and HC presidential debate 2016.

Table 5. Politeness Analysis Finding

No	Types of Politeness Analysis	Finding in the Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton Presidential Debate 2016.
1	Bald-on Record Strategy	13
2	Positive Politeness Strategy	24
3	Negative Politeness Strategy	31
4	Off Record Politeness	10
	Total	78

Based on the table above, the researcher wanted to describe the types of politeness analysis into several parts, which will be the main object of this research. The strategies of politeness there are bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off the record. The result of research from bald on record in DT and HC presidential debate 2016 can found the expressing of politeness. In the DT and HC presidential debate 2016, the researcher found 13 expressing politeness. The positive politeness in the researcher obtained 24 expressing of politeness in the debate. In negative politeness, the researcher acquired 31 expressing, and off-record got 10 expressing of politeness. The result of politeness expressed in DT and HC presidential debate 2016 is 78 expressing.

5. CONCLUSION

After analyzing the data and based on the research finding and data analysis in the chapter before, the researcher arranges a conclusion. Based on the analysis in the previous chapter, there were some conclusions that the researcher made in this library research, the conclusion of this analysis was: Politeness is a form of communicative action that is so common in human language and has become a culture among human life, and has even been associated as a universal phenomenon in people's lives. Although politeness has been discovered and studied in various cultures worldwide over the years, the theory of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson has come to be highly influential and has created controversy in academic circles. They brought about politeness as a universal concept with four models. Based on the analysis result, there are Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies in DT and HC presidential debate 2016. They are bald on record (13), positive politeness (24), negative politeness (31), and off-record (10). So the total politeness in DT and HC presidential debate 2016 is 78. The most dominant politeness that occurred in the DT and HC presidential debate 2016 is negative politeness on 31.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedure Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Batubara, M. (2020). On Pragmatic Implicature: Political Languages In 2018 Elections In Aceh. *International Journal of Humanity Studies (IJHS), 3*(2), 251-265. doi:https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.v3i2.2189

Batubara, M. (2020). An Analysis of Speech Functions Realizations on the Electronics and Furniture Billboard Texts. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi, 18*(3), 303-311. doi:https://doi.org/10.31315/jik.v18i3.3563

Bogdan, R.C. and Biklen, K. S. (1992). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1988). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4). *TESOL Quarterly*, *22*(4), 660. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587263

Charles, R. Mayer. (2002). *Introducing English Linguistics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cutting, John. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: Resource Book For Student.* London: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1955). On Face-Work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry*, *18*(3), 213–231.
    https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1955.11023008

Griffiths, Patrick. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men and politeness*. London: Longman.

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matthew, B. and A. Miles, Michael Huberman. (2005). *Qualitative Data Analysis.* Jakarta: UI Press.

Mey, Jacob. L. (2015). *Pragmatik Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Erlannga.

Nazir, M. (2003). *Metode Penelitian.* Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Rowe, B. M. and D. P. L. (2016). *A concise introduction to linguistics (4th ed).* New York: Routledge.

Shahsavari, S., Alimohammadi, B., & Rasekh, A. (2014). Compliment responses: A comparative study of native English speakers and Iranian L2 speakers. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*(2014), 1744–1753.
    doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.602

Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece: A cross-cultural perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Subroto, Edi. (1992). *Pengantar Metoda Penelitian Linguistic Structural.* Surakarta: University Press.

Sugiyono. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Administrasi*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman Pearson.

Varga, László. (2010). *Introduction to English Linguistics.* Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University Budapest.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* New York: Blackwell.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Key topics in Sociolinguistics politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zed, Mestika. (2008). *Metode Penelitian Kepustakaan.* Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.