How to be Gentle: Reformulating Advice and Command Illocutions

Sedik K. Oda

Dkar Centre for History studies

ABSTRACT

In communication, speakers need to be polite toward the hearers by considering their social level, age, situation, and condition. The aim of the study is to identify the types of politeness strategies employed by political elites when addressing their audiences. The focus is on the use of politeness strategies, particularly in directive speech acts, including positive and negative face-threatening acts and face-saving acts. This includes a qualitative analysis of the textual features that drive the discourse representation of politeness and the contextual factors that influence the choice of rhetorical tactics in political speeches by drawing upon Brown and Levinson's (1987) methodology and framework of politeness strategies. The data of this study comprises former US president Barack Obama's victory speech when he was elected president of the United States. Politicians tended to use more positive politeness strategies in their political speeches, frequently FSAs in comparison with FTA and bald-off-record. This helps them save their own face and build unity among participants and their former opponents

Keywords: Politeness, Directives, Face-threatening act, Face-saving act, politics

1. Introduction

Through the use of language, humans can express all kinds of information to each other and be (im)polite under command. A person not only produces speech containing words and grammatical structures but also shows actions through his/her speech which is then speech activity events or speech acts. Searle (1979), in his book entitled "Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language" states that speech acts are actions displayed through speech (the performance of speech acts). Speech act in a term of pragmatics determines some main factors like presupposition and implicature in a particular context (Levinson, 1983). Speech acts could be verified into a truth-conditional meaning based on logical positivism in a set of the principle of sentences. Yule (1996) claimed that in attempting speech acts, there is a set of mindsets about grammatical features and words that are shaped in performance or actions.

The discussion of speech acts is included in the realm of pragmatics, which is a field of linguistics that studies the relationship between the external language and the purpose of the speech. Pragmatics is the study of the contextual and intended meaning. According to the pragmatic context, utterance needs to be set in a good design among semantics and pragmatics context (Geis 1995: 217).

The use of speech acts does not only stop at what is spoken by the speakers but also how the speech partners understand the messages delivered (Grundlingh, 2017). In this study, the focus is on directive speech acts, which were in the form of a speaker's direction so that the speech partner does something. In their directives, speakers can be (im)polite, showing their face-saving act and face-threatening act, particularly when constructing an imperative statement. It can be argued that the genesis of language itself began with the use of imperative statements. The present article considers the main characteristics of the imperative (advice and command) in the building of politeness, as well as specifics of the semantic and pragmatic functions of politeness.

Among the most important features of the im(polite) communicative behaviour of the person is the expression of incentive to action. The incentive to the action can be expressed by various means. One of the main means of its expression is face-saving act and face-threatening acts which play a vital role in the organization of interpersonal communication in a natural language. The functional importance of politeness is illustrated by the fact that forms of the imperative can be referred to the language phenomena of universal character as they are presented in the majority of languages of the world.

2. Advice and command in constructing politeness

Kreidler (1998, p.190) states that "command and advice are effective only if the speaker has some degree of control over the actions of the addressee". Among the directive strategies in politeness are reminding, calling and asking speech acts. Asking directive speech act is an option for a strategy that is relatively subtle and polite because it provides space for choice for speech partners (Prayitno, 2019; Van Der Bom and Grainger, 2015). The reminding type of directive speech act enables the speaker to remind the hearer of doing something according to the speaker's desire or common desire (Prayitno et al., 2020; Vasilishina, 2017). Calling speech acts provide a choice of space for speech partners to fulfil the invitation (Westbrook, 2007; Lee and Bailey, 2020).

When using directives and minding the face of others, Yule (1996: 60) states that "politeness in an interaction can be defined as the means to show awareness of another person's face". The knowledge of politeness is important because politeness has an instrumental role in social interaction. Politeness theory is best expressed as the practical application of good manners or etiquette. It characterizes linguistic features mediating norms of social behaviour in relation to such notions as courtesy, rapport, deference and distance. Such features include the use of special discourse markers as please, sorry, if you like, acceptable forms of address and paralinguistic features as facial expressions and bodily movement. It is a culturally defined phenomenon, and therefore what is considered polite in one culture can sometimes be quite rude or simply strange in another culture. Being polite therefore consists of attempting to save face for another. Lakoff (1975: 64) defines it as a mechanism developed by individuals in order to reduce friction in personal interaction' The assumption here is that friction in personal interaction is undesirable, and that individuals develop the strategy of politeness to reduce that friction. Brown and Levinson (1978) 'view politeness as a complex system for softening face-threatening.They present a definition of politeness which avoids becoming embroiled over impoliteness. Leech (1980: 19) defines it as strategic conflict avoidance .it is the degree of effort put into the avoidance of a conflict situation and the establishment and maintenance of comity. There are many theories of politeness and politeness strategies that need to be explained, as illustrated in the following sections.

Some of the earliest work in politeness theory came from Robin Lakoff (1975). she argued, a phenomenon of politeness entirely dependent on context, and on aspects of context as specific as the relationship between two people (Chapman,2005:215). Her particular claim is that certain features of English sentences can be explained only in terms of the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Lakoff discusses the use of modal verbs in offers and requests, considering why, for instance, *You must have some of this cake*' counts as a more polite form than '*You should have some of this cake*'. Their social meaning is often dependent not just on the form used but the implications this triggers. The verb 'must' implies, generally contrary to the facts of the case, that the hearer has no choice but to eat the cake, hence that the cake is not in itself desirable, and that the speaker is politely modest about the goods she is offering.

Lakoff suggests three 'rules of politeness', analogous to Grice` maxims of conversation; they are :

1.   don't impose

2.   give options

3.   make hearer feel good – be friendly

1-The first rule **don't impose** (Distance) explains why people choose lengthy or syntactically complex expressions in apparent breach of clarity, such as

A: May I ask how much you paid for that vase, Mr Hoving?

Rule 1 states that we keep distance from others by not imposing. In order to keep distance from others, she points out that we tend to use formal expressions or use technical vocabulary to exclude personal emotions.

2-The second rule *give options* (Deference*)* explains the use of hedges and euphemisms such as:

A: I hear that the butler Marion making it in the pantry. expressions give hearers the superficial option of not interpreting an expression in a way they may find offensive.

Deference is characterized by saying things hesitantly, by not stating one's will clearly or by using euphemisms. It involves the status difference of the speaker and the hearer, and the speaker yields to the power of the hearer by leaving the option of a decision to the hearer.

3-The third rule *make A feel good* (Camaraderie) explains nicknames and particles expressing feeling and involving the hearer, particles such as 'like', 'y know', 'I mean'. All these conversational features might appear to be in breach of one or more maxim; in effect, the more powerful rules of politeness explain why and when the conversational maxims are breached. Lakoff suggests that Grice's rules of conversation are perhaps best seen as 'subcases' of Rule 1. In other words, the tendency towards clarity is not to impose on your addressee.

Though Leech and Lakoff used the term maxim they employ it in a different manner to Grice. Grace's maxims focus more on expectations regarding language and how information is conveyed in everyday conversation (quality quantity, relevance and manner) whereas Lakoff's and Leech's maxims are more to do with interpersonal relations i.e. how to express emotion and underlying feelings.

3. Framework and methodology

This study draws upon one of the leading methodologies of politeness analysis developed by Brown and Levinson (1987), who argue that there are two forms of politeness: positive politeness and negative politeness. The concept of **face** is central to Brown and Levinson's politeness. This concept was introduced by Goffman (1967). Goffman defines **face** as the positive social value a person claims for himself. **Face** is an image of self delineating in terms of approved social attributes. Thomas (1983: 168)considers face within politeness theory as every individual feeling of self-image; this image can be damaged or maintained through interaction with others.Yule(1996:134) defines face as the public self-image which is the emotional and social sense that everyone has and expects everyone else recognizes. Politeness, in this sense, is showing awareness of another person's face.

3.1 Aspects of Face

There are two aspects of face: positive face and negative face.

- Positive face is the want of every member to be desirable to at least some others. It is the need to be connected and to be a member of the

group (Yule, 1996:134).

- Negative face: the want of every member that his actions be unimpeded by others. It is the need to be independent and to have freedom from imposition (Ibid).

1. Face Threatening Act (FTA)

Certain illocutionary acts are liable to threaten or damage the hearer's positive face for example expressions of disapproval/criticism, contradictions, interrupting, etc. Others threaten his/her negative face such as orders, requests, reminders, offers, promises, etc.

Moreover, certain acts can also be face threatening to the speaker's positive face, such as expressing thanks, excuses, acceptance of offers, etc., as well as threatening his/her negative face, such as *apologies, acceptance of compliments, confessions/admissions of guilt or responsibility*, etc.

    a.   Positive Face Threatening Acts

Positive face is threatened when the speaker or hearer does not care about their interactor's feelings, wants, or does not want what the other wants. Positive face-threatening acts can also cause damage to the speaker or the hearer. When an individual is forced to be separated from others.

- Affecting the Hearer

An act that expresses the speaker's negative assessment of the hearer's positive face e.g. *insults, accusations, interrupting, boasting, disrespect, disagreements, or challenges*. The speaker can display this disapproval in two ways.

1. The speaker dislikes some aspect of the hearer's possessions, desires, or personal attributes.

2. the speaker expresses disapproval by stating or implying that the hearer is wrong, irrational, or misguided.

e.g. I don't agree with you

 this is awful

Affecting the Speaker

An act that shows that the speaker is in some sense wrong and unable to control himself: acceptance of a compliment, inability to control one's physical self, inability to control one's emotional self, self-humiliation, confessions.

e.g. *would you write you address please forgive me for these bad sayings*

    b.   Negative Face Threatening Acts

Negative face is threatened when an individual does not avoid the obstruction of their interlocutor's freedom of action. It can cause damage to either the speaker or the hearer and makes one of the interlocutors submit their will to the other. Freedom of choice and action is impeded when a negative face is threatened.

- **Affecting the Hearer**

An act that creates pressure on the hearer to either perform or not perform the act. Examples: *orders, requests, suggestions offers hatred, anger, threats, or warnings*.

e.g. write your homework now

  did not you finish

- **Affecting the Speaker**

An act that shows that the speaker is succumbing to the power of the hearer. For example, *expressing thanks, apology, acceptance of offers, the speaker commits himself to something he does not want to do*.

e.g. *I'm sorry, you cant take my car again*

  yes, I have wet these papers

2. Face Saving Act (FSA)

These acts refer to actions including expressions that satisfy the face wants of the interlocutors, including the speaker and the listener. Several strategies have been used by politicians including but not limited to the following (see Kalu, 2018).

- **Welcoming**

In this strategy, the politician uses a welcoming tone and words to his interlocutors. The communicator becomes warm towards the audience and in many cases to their opponents who before the time of speaking could not have treated them in the same manner

- **Speaking Positive**

Speakers use this strategy as good communicators are courteous and they take the interlocutors to be vital to them and address them positively as friends, partners, and essential people. Politicians need both the electorate to vote for them and opponents for comparison during campaigns.

- **Praise**

The use of praise is a politeness strategy to identify the achievements of their interlocutors or things they are talented at and highlight them. Politicians really exploit this when their senior or party leader is present and they expect to be viewed in a positive light and probably be appointed to higher office or even be endorsed by the electorate.

- **Humor**

This is the use of words, situations and even stories that elicit humour and therefore provide comic relief to the listeners/audience. Some politicians can use oral narratives especially tricksters and leave their audience in stitches. Others use proverbs and riddles that help them put their point across.

- **Clapping**

This is as a way of appreciation employed by communicators to request the listeners/audience to clap for someone as a way of appreciation. After-before a specific person has spoken before an audience, s/he may get a round of applause as an appreciation of what s/he has done and will be doing to the audience.

3.2 Politeness Strategies

Politeness strategies are used to formulate messages in order to save the hearer's and speaker's face when face-threatening acts are inevitable or desired. Brown and Levinson outline four main types of politeness strategies: bald on-record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record (indirect).

1. Bald- On-record

It is most often utilized in situations where the speaker has a close relationship with the audience, such as family or close friends. The speaker decides in such cases that the overall weightiness of the FTA is very small. Brown and Levinson outline various cases in which one might use the bald on-record strategy, including:

- *Task-oriented*

Pass me the hammer.

- *Little or no desire to maintain someone's face*

Don't forget to clean the dishes!

- *Offers*

I'll clean them up later.

2. Positive Politeness

Positive politeness strategies seek to minimize the threat to the hearer's positive face. They are used to make the hearer feel good about himself, and are most usually used in situations where the participants know each other fairly well. some strategies of positive politeness include statements of friendship, solidarity, and compliments, for example:

- *Attend to H's interests*

You look sad. Can I do anything?

- *Offer or promise*

If you wash the dishes, I'll vacuum the floor.

3. Negative Politeness

Negative politeness strategies are oriented towards the hearer's negative face and emphasize avoidance of imposition on the hearer. Examples from Brown and Levinson include:

- *Be indirect*

Would you know where Oxford Street is?

- *Use hedges or questions*

Perhaps, he might have taken it, maybe.

- *Apologize*

I'm sorry; it's a lot to ask, but can you lend me a thousand dollars?

- *Use plural pronouns*

We regret to inform you.

4. Off-record (indirect)

The final politeness strategy outlined by Brown and Levinson is the indirect strategy; This strategy uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the potential to be imposing. For example, a speaker using the indirect strategy might merely say a hint :

"wow, it's getting cold in here"

This would be nice if the listener turns the air conditioner off.

5. Payoffs Associated with each Strategy

In deciding which strategy to use, the speaker runs through the individual payoffs of each strategy.

1. *Bald on record*

   - avoids danger of being misunderstood

2. *Positive Politeness*

   - minimizes threatening aspect by assuring what S considers to be of the same kind with H

   - when S includes himself equally as a participant in the request or offer.

3. *Negative Politeness*

   - keep social distance and not get too familiar with the addressee

4. *Off record*

   - be tactful

   - avoid responsibility for face-damaging

Brown and Levinson argue that three different sociological variables, determine the weightiness of politeness. These are the following: (Bowe and martine,2007:27)

1- **The social distance** (D) of Speaker and Hearer which includes the different social classes upper class, working class where the upper class used to save (FTA) toward the lower classes.

2- **The relative power** (P) of Speaker and Hearer which includes the social power of some individuals on others e.g. the waiter-customer relation, the soldier-officer relation etc.

3- **The absolute ranking** (R) of imposition in the particular culture which includes

a-the right of the speaker to perform the act.

b-the degree to which the hearer welcomes the imposition.

these are the Sociological Variables that should be taken into consideration when deciding whether and how to use the various strategies in real-life situations.

3.3 Politeness, context, power

Another topic investigated in sociolinguistic and pragmatic research is the social conditions of politeness. As far as the context of a person is concerned, it influences the degree of politeness. Familiar people tend to use less impolite forms among themselves. For example, in Italian the familiar pronoun is tu when it is used with strangers or in formal situations, it will be impolite use, but to be polite in such cases, one should use the polite form pronoun Lei (Trudgil,1973:106).

The distinction in the use of pronouns according to the context of the person extends to the notion of power. The higher classes use the polite forms, V forms, amongst themselves while the lower classes use the less polite forms, T forms amongst themselves. The higher classes use the less polite T forms to call the lower classes while the lower classes use the more polite V forms to talk with the higher classes. This use expresses the notion of power between the higher and lower classes of society(Ibid).

3.4 Degree of optionality and degree of politeness

Here we also follow Leech (1983) in his understanding of optionality as the degree of freedom that the speaker gives the hearer to decide whether he wants to perform the required action or not. Since restricting someone's freedom is generally perceived as negative in our social system, optionality

degrees correlate with politeness degrees. As such, optionality is strictly intertwined with the degree of politeness between the interlocutors and consequently with other interpersonal variables such as formality and intimacy. (Laurence,2007). Compare the following two utterances:

(12) Could you close the door?

(13) Would you close the door?

The capacity and willingness conditions are activated through the use of oblique models, which have the communicative consequence of increasing the degree of politeness of the requests. Similarly, the use of negative models has the opposite result of decreasing the optionality of the hearer, who may refuse to carry out the action required, thereby rendering the act impolite:

(14) Can't you close the door?

Won't you close the door?

Optionality is here based on an interesting communicative strategy. The speaker acts as if he were surprised to see that the hearer is unable or unwilling to perform the required action. The underlying idea, which is now part of the conventional meaning of the construction, is captured by the following paraphrase: "You should have closed the door, but you haven't, which surprises me. Is it because you are unable or unwilling to do so?" The hearer will generally find it difficult to refuse since it is obvious that he has the capacity to close a door and, by cultural convention, he is expected to be willing to help other people.

1.5 Criticism of Brown & Levinson's theory

Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness has been criticized as not being universally valid. ***One of the key problems*** with Brown Levinson's theory is that it is concerned principally with face-threatening acts while interaction does not exist entirely on face-threatening acts. A situation such as assistance, mutual appreciation and praise contribute to building positive face between individuals. ***The second problem*** is that Brown and Levinson's model of characterization of positive politeness strategies in terms of familiarity solidarity and informality alone. There are many social contexts in the English-speaking world in which affirmation of the positive self-image, e.g. age, experience, status. ***The third problem*** is that Brown & Levinson's model is based on the individual rather than the social group.

3.6 The Universality of Politeness –Social context

All cultures seem to share this specific concept and express it in either linguistic or non-linguistic ways (Bousoulenga,2004:17). Linguistic ways include such expressions as (excuse me, would you please, forgive me, your permission, etc.) while non-linguistic or paralinguistics include (warm look, friendly smile, bodily movement and much of facial expression, etc.)It is generally accepted that various markers whether linguistic or non-linguistic contribute to the politeness of an utterance existed in the framework of cultural differences. But Leech (1983) mentioned that different socio-cultural norms are reflected in all levels of the linguistic code. Therefore, when observing politeness norms the researcher should always take into account the relationship between the Speaker and the Hearer and the nature of the interaction in which they are involved Within their framework of Politeness.

3.7 Categories of the Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure

Thomas (1983) classified cross-cultural pragmatic failure into two types of categories: pragma-linguistic failure and socio-linguistic failure. The former refers to the failures made by the second language learners because the extra pragmatic meaning of the mother language is completely different from the ones of the target language and the customs of the mother language from the target language. While the latter refers to the failures made by the second language learners because the different culture leads to the improper choice of the language form. The distinction between the two is not absolute.

3.8 Pragmatic-Linguistic Failure

This type of linguistic failure occurs when a speaker uses ambiguous words or misuse words which cannot be understood by the interpreter. Pragmatic failure also occurs when speakers do not express the implication of their speech. The reason is that the learners have transferred the strategies of speech acts or that the equivalent words of mother language are not the same as the target language's, therefore, the failure is brought out. The transference of pragma-linguistic rules of the mother language to the target language

Languages are differently equipped to express different real-world relations, and they certainly do not express all aspects of meaning with equal ease. Differences in grammatical structures of the mother and target languages often result in some changes in the information content of the message during the process of communication. This change takes the form of adding information to the target language, which is not expressed in the mother language. This can happen when the mother language lacks this grammatical category of the target language. Details which are ignored in the mother language but which have to be specified in the target language can pose a serious dilemma for the communicators if they cannot be reasonably inferred from the context.

3.8.1 Number

The idea of number is so universal in the sense that it is readily accessible to all human beings and it is expressed in the lexical structure of all languages. However, not all languages have a grammatical category of number. As we know, English recognizes a distinction between one and more than

one(singular and plural). This distinction has to be expressed morphologically, by adding a suffix to a noun or by changing its form in some other way to indicate whether it refers to one or more than one: student/students, fix/fixes, man/men, child/children. The form of a noun in Chinese does not normally indicate whether it is singular or plural. For example:

A:I am going to leave for Shanghai tomorrow.

B:Don't forget to take the two luggages*with you.

In this communication, pragma-linguistic failure has come out. Luggage is a collection noun and also an uncountable one. The plural form of the word luggage should be expressed as two pieces of luggage. So, B should say "Don't forget to take the two pieces of luggage with you."

3.8.2 Social-Pragmatic Failure

Since the communicators don't know each other's cultural background and the differences between their principles in communication such as different social values, different social customs, and different social statuse, the socio-pragmatic failure is caused naturally during their communications.

Different cultural background has different customs, ways of life, thoughts and so on. In cross-cultural communication, the communicators have ignored the differences between their cultural backgrounds and then the social pragmatic failure is brought out.   For example, Chinese students want to ask their foreign teacher to revise their English application of entering a school. They would make remarks as follows:

    a.   You see I've never written a letter in English before, so I've probably made lots of mistakes.

    b.   I'm very sorry to interrupt you. You see I've never written a letter in English before, so I've probably made lots of mistakes.

    c.   I wonder if you are free or not. You see I've never written a letter in English before, so I've probably made lots of mistakes.

Round ways have been adopted in all the discourses above to express "request". In these, Chinese students' opinions, it is impolite to ask the teacher to revise their letters directly. Obviously, they are following the pragmatic rules of the Chinese. However, in English the communicators will directly ask their teacher by saying "Would you like to give me a hand to revise my application of entering a school?" Therefore, in this communication,   the teacher will get no hints from the discourse and also he or she cannot understand the students' purposes. In a word, it has led to socio-pragmatic failure.

4. Data, analysis and discussion

4.1 Data

The data of this study comprised Barack Obama's victory speech delivered in Chicago, 4 November 2008. President-Elect Barack Obama calls himself the unlikeliest presidential candidate. He thanks many members of his campaign, along with his enormous army of volunteers, and he warns supporters about what he calls the enormity of the tasks at hand that now face the U.S. Viewed on television and the Internet by millions of people around the globe, Obama's speech focused on the major issues facing the United States and the world, all echoed through his campaign slogan of change. He also mentioned his maternal grandmother Madelyn Dunham, who had died just two nights earlier.

4.2 Analysis and discussion

In his speech, Obama focused on the major issues facing the United States and the world, minding politeness strategies when discussing the issues. Excerpts were taken from his speeches and qualitatively analysed for (im)politeness. The analysis was carried out by collecting the directive speech acts and qualitatively analyzing the sentences giving each example a code for each directive speech act. This code was used to make the analysis easier and for the researcher to identify the politeness strategy used by the speaker (Obama).

As illustrated in Table 1, significantly frequently, Obama used a positive politeness strategy in his addressing the audience, showing his basic desire for their public self-image that wants to be shown engagement, ratification, and appreciation from others-the want to be wanted. There was also the use of negative politeness in Obama addressing the audience. The negative politeness also recognizes Obama's face, showing that he is in some way imposing on the hearer. The negative face represents the want of every action to get freedom from impingement. Less common was the use of bald-on record politeness strategy by Obama in his speech to the public when elected president of the US. He was most explicit in his politeness strategy avoiding being ambiguous or requiring the audience to infer what he means when addressing various international issues.

Table 1. Frequency of politeness strategies analysis

Code	Politeness Strategy	Percentage (%)
(1)	Positive Politeness 7	50
(2)	Negative Politeness 4	29
(3)	Bald on record 3	21

Excerpt 1:

To my campaign manager, David Plouffe; my chief strategist, David Axelrod; and the best campaign team ever assembled in the history of politics — you made this happen, and I am forever grateful for what you've sacrificed to get it done

In this excerpt, "*you made this happen* " is a reminding type of directive speech act, when the speech partner does something according to the speaker's desire or common desire (Prayitno et al., 2020; Vasilishina, 2017). The context of the speech occurred because according to the speakers, the campaign is responsible for the election win and they should not forget that and Obama is reminding them of their effort to succeed in that election. This directive expresses Obama's praise of the Americans who elected him as the president of the US, and his campaign for the effort they give to succeed in his election campaign. His thanks by being grateful in "I am forever grateful" is an example of positive FSA. Obama uses a face-saving act to the positive face of the audience by showing show solidarity, emphasising that both speakers want the same thing and that they have a common goal. This is an example of positive FSA of the speaker, showing that the speaker is succumbing to the power of the hearer

Directives were not the only speech act strategies used in this positive politeness strategy. The use of assertive speech act was also common, as illustrated in excerpt 2:

But above all, I will never forget who this victory truly belongs to — it belongs to you. I was never the likeliest candidate for this office. We didn't start with much money or many endorsements. Our campaign was not hatched in the halls of Washington — it began in the backyards of Des Moines and the living rooms of Concord and the front porches of Charleston.

In this excerpt, again, Obama speaks positively about the American people for electing him the president of the US and being the winner of this election, not only him. He refers to his victory as theirs and his success as theirs too, expressing his respect to all of them, not only those who elected him as the president. His appreciation is an example of positive FSA, as Obama is succumbing to the power of the audience who elected him the president of the US.

Excerpt 3:

I would not be standing here tonight without the unyielding support of my best friend for the last 16 years, the rock of our family and the love of my life, our nation's next first lady, Michelle Obama. Sasha and Malia, I love you both so much,

In his opening speech, Obama tries to express his love for Michele and his daughters. The calling speech acts "*Michelle Obama. Sasha and Malia, I love you both so much*" provides a choice of space for speech partners to fulfil the invitation (see for instance, Westbrook, 2007; Lee and Bailey, 2020). This type of speech act of calling is also a representation of the public interest (Dynel and Poppi, 2019; Mirhosseini, Mardanshahi, and Dowlatabadi, 2017). The purpose is to make Michele and his daughters happy and proud of him for being the elected president of the US. He also wants to bring to attention that Michele is very special and he is so lucky man to have her beside him in this election. This positive politeness is used to satisfy the hearer's positive face (Michele), therefore, it contributes to establishing relationships of intimacy and solidarity.

Excerpt 4:

While we breathe, we hope, and where we are met with cynicism, and doubt, and those who tell us that we can't, we will respond with that timeless creed that sums up the spirit of a people: Yes, we can.

In this utterance, Obama wants to tell the audience that the democrats have won over the republicans who thought that the democrats would not win the election. In his answer "Yes, we can" he expresses asking directive, one of the options for a strategy that is relatively subtle and polite because it provides space for choice for speech partners (Prayitno, H.J., 2019; Van Der Bom and Grainger, 2015). Obama criticizes the Republicans for not believing the public who has chosen the right president. He also brings to light the impoliteness of that party by being cynical and doubtful of the democrats "we are met with cynicism, and doubt".

This is an example of negative FTA, where Obama expresses a negative assessment of the republicans' face being cynical and doubtful. Obama explicitly criticizes the republicans with real meaning and no implicature behind his description of his rivals and competitor in the US election. He brings out the fact that the Republican convention is to talk about everything they think is wrong with America by criticism, though they cannot make America better. This on-record strategy is classified as giving explicit insult stating explicitly what the republicans are and letting the audience explicitly know the message he is delivering to them.

Excerpt 5:

Let us remember that it was a man from this state who first carried the banner of the Republican Party to the White House — a party founded on the values of self-reliance, individual liberty and national unity.

In this excerpt Obama is asking the US people to unite, democrats and republicans. This is another example of asking directive, where a negative FTA is used "*Let us remember that it was a man from this state*". This is a type of negative politeness strategy, where Obama shows claims common ground as the same set person with the audiences as the American society. He reminds us of the shared values and traditions among Americans. The function of this statement is to seek agreement among the public. This is a bald-on-record politeness strategy with little or no desire to maintain someone's face "*Let us remember that it was a man*".

5. Conclusion

This study was aimed at identifying the politeness strategies in directive speech acts. This study provides a novelty of the directive speech act of politeness in political speeches and its implications for strengthening political interest, as in the case of former US president Barack Obama. The analysis revealed

that the use of directive speech acts was identified as having the intention of asking, reminding and calling speech acts when addressing the audience. The positive politeness strategy of the reminding type of directive speech act refers to when the speech partner does something according to the speaker's desire or common desire (Prayitno et al., 2020; Vasilishina, 2017). Obama uses this type of politeness strategy to seek unity among the Americans, praising them for electing him the president of the US, and his campaign for the effort they give to succeed in his election campaign. The calling speech act of politeness provides a choice of space for speech partners to fulfil the invitation, and a representation of the public interest (Westbrook, 2007; Lee and Bailey, 2020). The purpose of this positive face-saving politeness strategy is to make the audience happy and proud of the speaker, as Obama is the elected president of the US. This positive politeness is used to satisfy the audience's positive face, contributing to establishing relationships of intimacy and solidarity. Asking directive speech act was also used as a politeness strategy in the representation of negative FTA. This directive provides a strategy that is relatively subtle and polite because it provides space for choice for speech partners, as in the case when Obama criticizes the republican for not believing the public who has chosen the right president "*we will respond with that timeless creed that sums up the spirit of a people: Yes, we can*". Politicians tended to use more positive politeness strategies in their political speeches, frequently FSAs in comparison with FTA and bald-off-record. This helps them save their face and build unity among participants and their former opponents

References

Bousoulenga, A. (2005). POLITENESS PHENOMENA IN GREEK AND ENGLIS

Crystal, D. (2003). A *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

David A. (1996).*Politeness as a universal variable in cross-cultural managerial communication*. Bowling green

Dynel, M., & Poppi, F. I. M. (2019). Risum Teneatis , Amici? : The Socio-Pragmatics of Roastme Humour. Journal of Pragmatics, 139, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.10.010

Geis, Michael. (1995). Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction. United States of America: Cambridge University Press.

Goodman, B.(2004) *Cross Cultural Varieties of Politeness. New York:PUP*

Guodong, L. and Jing, H. (2005). *A Contrastive Study on Disagreement Strategies for Politeness between American English & Mandarin Chinese* Volume 7. Issue 1.Article 10

Kalu, K. (2018). UNMASKING FACE THREATENING AND FACE SAVING ACTS OF POLITICIANS: A CASE STUDY OF MWINGI REGION POLITICIANS. Nairobi University

Kreidler, Charles W. (1998). *Introducing English Semantics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper and Row

Lakoff, T. (2005). *Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness*. Amsterdam. John Benjamins

Lee, A. R., & Bailey, D. R. (2020). Examining South Korean University Students ' Interactions with International Students. Asian Journal of University Education (AJUE), 16(3), 43–58.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London:Longman

Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). Pragmatics. United States of America: Cambridge University Press.

Mirhosseini, M., Mardanshahi, M., & Dowlatabadi, H. (2017). Impoliteness Strategies Based on Culpeper ' s Model : An Analysis of Gender Differences between Two Characters in The Movie Mother. Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 4(3), 221–238. Retrieved from http://www.jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/view/579/pdf579

Ogiermann, E.(2009). *On Apologising in Negative and Positive Politeness Cultures*. Amsterdam.John Benjamins.

Prayitno, H. J., Sari, I. D., Nasucha, Y., Ratih, K., Dyah, R., Norliza, U., … Badri, A. (2020). Speech Act of Hate Speech in The Discourse of ILC TalkShow TvOne: Literature Study on Humanity Using Psycho-Pragmativ Prespective. PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION, 57, 1–22.

Prayitno, H.J., et all. (2019). Politicopragmatic P ower of Positive Hospitality Comment of The Followers Account of Indonesia's President Jokowi Instagram Oriented to The Character Education in The Disruption Era 52 Indonesian Journal on Learning and Advanced Education. Indonesian Journal on Learning and Advanced Education IJOLAE, 1(2), 52–71. https://doi.org/10.23917/ijolae.v1i2.8785.

Searle, J and Vanderveken, D. (1985). Foundation of Illocutionary Logic. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, John R. (1979). Expression and Meaning: Studies in The Theory of Speech Acts. United States of America: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, J. (1983). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Van Der Bom, I., & Grainger, K. (2015). Journal of Politeness Research: Introduction. Journal of Politeness Research, 11(2), 165–178. https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2015-0007

Vasilishina, Y. N. (2017). Cognitive-Pragmatic Interpretation of Blending Characters in V.V. Nabokov's Proses. Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 9(1), 57–67. https://doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n1.07

Versechueren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Versechueren.

Watts.R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: CUP

Westbrook, L. (2007). Chat Reference Communication Patterns and Implications: Applying Politeness Theory. Journal of Documentation, 63(5), 638–658. https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410710827736

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

Yule, G. (1996).*The Study of Language*. Cambridge: CUP.