Face Threatening Act in US Presidential Candidate First Debate Between Joe Biden and Donald Trump on Daily Mail and YouTube's Sky news 2020

Rofiq Zhahari Adi, Hartono, Ria Nirwana

Faculty of English Literature
University of Al-Ghifari
Jl. Cisaranten Kulon No.140, Kec. Arcamanik, Kota Bandung, 40293
javier.rofiq@gmail.com

hartono@unfari.ac.id, ria.nirwana2@gmail.com, javier.rofiq@gmail.com

Abstract

The topic of this research is about the first debate of US presidential candidates conducted in 2020 between Joe Biden and Donald Trump. This study aimed to analyze indirect politeness in the debate. This research used Brown and Levinson's politeness theory with 4 categories of direct speech act politeness and two FTAs, namely: (1)bald on record (2)positive politeness (3)negative politeness (4)off record. Face Threatening Act is divided into two, namely: (1)FTA speaker (2)FTA listener. This research used the qualitative descriptive method, so descriptive research could characterize a phenomenon's situation. It means that descriptive research will provide more information than the researcher who had collected the data requires. The researcher had analyzed conversations during debates between presidential candidates using Brown and Levinson's theory with a total of 61 data, and 45 data as analysis material. This research is aimed at the readers and further researchers can be used as a reference and especially for researcher. Joe Biden did dominant indirect speech act was emotional, and Trump did dominant with accusations indicating that Trump was focused on his opponent. Trump as a speaker also dominates over Biden's speech. Dominant as much as this includes Trump who more often interrupts the conversation with the meaning behind his words. Politeness is a way other than expressing one's attitude towards others besides that because this is a human attitude to respect other people.

Keywords: *politeness, face threatening act, indirect speech act, debate*

Abstrak

Topic penelitian ini tentang debat pertama para calon presiden US yang dilakukan pada tahun 2020 antara Joe Biden dan Donald Trump. Pada penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis tindak kesopanan tidak langsung pada saat debat. Penelitian ini menggunakan teori kesopanan Brown and Levinson dengan 4 kateogri kesopanan direct speech act dan dua FTA, yaitu: (1)bald on record (2)positive politeness (3)negative politeness (4)off record. Face Threatening Act terbagi dua yaitu: (1)FTA speaker (2)FTA hearer. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode qualitative descriptive, maka Penelitian deskriptif mampu mencirikan situasi suatu fenomena. Ini berarti bahwa penelitian deskriptif akan memberikan lebih banyak informasi daripada yang dibutuhkan peneliti yang telah mengumpulkan data. Peneliti telah menganalisis percakapan saat debat antara calon presiden menggunakan teori brown and levinson dengan jumlah keseluruhan 61 data, dan 45 data sebagai bahan analisis. Penelitian ini ditujukan pada readers dan peneliti selanjutnya bisa digunakan sebagai reference dan khusunya untuk peneliti. Tindak tutur tidak langsung dominan dilakukan Joe Biden adalah emosional, dan dominasi Trump dengan tuduhan menunjukkan bahwa Trump fokus pada lawannya. Trump sebagai pembicara juga

mendominasi pada pidato Biden. Dominan sebanyak ini termasuk Trump yang lebih sering menyela pembicaraan dengan makna di balik ucapannya. kesopanan adalah cara selain mengungkapkan sikap seseorang terhadap orang lain disamping itu, karena ini adalah sikap manusia untuk menghargai orang lain.

Keywords: *kesopanan, face threatening act, tindak tutur tidak langsung, debat*

Background Of Study

Language is the most basic way to communicate with fellow living beings understand each other, and there are many ways people to get interact socially. Everyone will interact with each other use anything devices or verbal facility to get communication because people consider in this an era Humans have many easy choices to communicate with other people (Hymes, 2005). Whether relying on electronics by telephone and send electronic mail or not, for example by speak directly face to face or indirectly, namely non-electronic. Humans cannot be separated from social interaction with each other, therefore they always need each other, human nature has selfishness and they will need other people to fulfill their desires, it can be achieved but humans cannot live alone because they are destined to live in groups and not individually. In human life, a strategy of decency as a social being is needed. Good communication and language are the way it is done to those who are younger, and of the same age as an attitude of respect and especially to older ones as an attitude of respect, this is one of the norms of decency in a culture (Huber-Kriegler et al., 2003). Politeness is the foundation or human way of communicat with others and this method is to get what others want and can be appreciated and to be accepted according to their wishes in the form of opinions, arguments, or requests.

The speaker always expressing what they want to get the attention of the listener with impolite willful or not, so there will be a response or attitude from the listener's face to react to what the speaker says and if the speaker wants to get attention from the listener. It depends on how to speaker's polite speech expressing to the listener and saves the listener's face, so the speaker gets positive face results. Refers to Fraser's (1981) theory, Humans and politeness strategies are the best steps to avoid negative faces and maintain moral attitudes through verbal or written. There are some factors such as Age, Gender, Place of Residence, Mood, Occupation, Personality, Subject, Place, Setting, Social Distance, Time Pressure, and Role are all factors to be considering while communicating. The speaker expressing reasonably if always express in a good way by the speaker, and it will get an impact on the listener's face which will produce a positive face. This way is also for the speaker to salvage the listener's face in public and face-to-face in a conversation, and this method is also to maintain harmony between the fellow.

The researcher decided to analyzed the presidential debate because of the debate on the election of the head of state. The image of each other would usually be dropped in front of the public debate. This research is directed to the researcher's self mainly and society in general. The debate is just the difference in views of everyone regarding the progress of a country or group, the content of the debate contains discussions on leadership, responsibility, honesty, politics, and many other things related to leading a country, region, or group. Therefore at the time, the debate was very difficult and tense. There are difficulties of people to be polite to their debate opponents because of the differences in views, but every human

being has the opportunity to be polite to their debate opponents to salvage people's faces. After the debate is over, and the candidates have reassuring the people with their respective political views besides of that between the candidates disagreed to their opponents, if it will be better debate candidates are highly recommended not to humiliate other candidates in public, politeness strategies at the time of candidate debate will be very necessary given that humans will not be separated from their nature as social beings and cannot live individually, therefore politeness and norms of decency are so the culture of society is very necessary.

People on daily communication, the person can be threatened embarrassment or diminish the other person's image. A face-threatening act is a term for this form of behavior (FTA). Such acts hinder other people's freedom of action and are referred to as negative faces in politeness strategies, as well as the desire of being liked by others, which is referred to as positive in politeness strategies.

This study would be focused on theory Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson (1987), the researcher would explored how many politeness the candidates did and how the presidential candidates responded to opinions from the point of view of other debate candidates by indirectly disclosing the candidates for the presidential debate in the United States did with the candidates for the debate, namely: Donald Trump and Joe Biden. In this study, several categories were studied, including (1) positive politeness, (2) negative politeness, (3) balance on record, (4) off record, and (1) positive face-threatening act, (2) Negative face-threatening act.

Identification Problem

The researcher choose this study with a discussion center, namely pragmatic

politeness, in line with the study discussed in the meaning of the report "the first US presidential candidates debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump in 2020."

1. How to find out the strategic face-threatening act used in the presidential debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump on the debate in 2020?
2. What are the benefits for readers and the next researchers to read analyze research face-threatening act on presidential candidate's debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump in 2020?

Research Objectives / Purpose And Objectives Of The Problem

The researcher has written issues above and the objectives of the problem that will discuss on points of research objectives to explain about it, and the purpose of these analyses of identification problem are:

1. To find a way the candidates' debate did face-threatening act refered to Brown and Levinson's theory of the strategies politeness to knew the candidates' debate presidential did face-threatening act.
2. To find the benefit for readers to analyze candidates' debate did face-threatening act. This research is how to see candidates respond to each other used Brown and Levinson's theory to expressed the statements other candidates, and the readers can see both of the candidates' good or bad meaning behind their expression statements or answering expression used theory face-threatening act by brown and Levinson.

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

2.1 Pragmatic

Politeness will always be needed while someone needs someone else with a politeness that does not forget someone's face and politeness must always be maintained while interacting socially with someone. While someone is participating in a verbal exchange, politeness is regarded as respect, which is something that must be preserved, maintained, or always considered. (Brownetal.,1987).

Language politeness, according to Richards in Rahardi (2005), is how language reveals the social distance between speakers and their relationship with a society's position. Different features of the language, such as length of speech, are the determinants of the form and rating of linguistic politeness. In using imperative Indonesian utterances, the use of words and/or phrases that mark politeness all influence the understanding of politeness. The intent of the speech, the time and appearance of the place of speech, the participants of the speech, and so on, type index data called the context of the situation of the speech.

2.2 Face Threatening Acts

Being polite may also involve the dimension of formality. In a formal situation, the appropriate way of talking to your brother will depend on your role in the context. Face concept and politeness strategies are very important for communities to understand each other and create a comfortable in conducting the conversation. (Holmes, 1992). In addition to the importance of linguistic structures while make conversation with the interlocutor, face concept and politeness strategies are very important for a community to give the understanding each other and create the comfortable in conducting the conversation. Being polite may also involve the dimension of formality.

As another way not to threaten the listener's face with a direct speech aimed at the listener, the speaker has a choice by uttering indirect speech acts. Someone has the opportunity to speak directly to the interlocutor but by not wanting the face of the interlocutor to respond negatively, and someone can use indirect speech acts as another way of speaking by saving the face of the interlocutor. Whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function, we have a direct speech act, according to (Hasanah & Sarage, 2017). In English, face-threatening acts or indirect speech acts are used more often than indirect speech acts are used more often. In English, indirect speech acts are more often linked with politeness than direct speech acts. (Taylor, 2013). Direct speech acts are used less frequently in English than face-threatening acts or indirect speech acts.

Politeness is a type of linguistic behavior focused on generating and maintaining harmonious encounters. Everyone will need each other even though they feel they don't need other people but basically, they will always need people. By maintaining harmony with each other, politeness must always be maintained to maintain someone's face. (Watts, 2003). Politeness is a sort of language conduct that aims to create and maintain pleasant interactions. Even though they believe they are self-sufficient, everyone will require the assistance of others. Politeness must constantly be maintained to maintain someone's face through preserving harmony with one another.

As a core of the language, pragmatics is part of a combination of language and meaning that is grammatically embedded in the structure of a language. Still related to each other. According to Stephen C. Levinson(1983), pragmatic is the study of the relation between language and meaning that is grammatical or embedded in the language

structure and also notes that pragmatic is the study of both language and context that is central to the comprehension of language. Mey(1993) notes that human language experiments are used because they are determined by the meaning of society. Pragmatic means that to get an understanding of language, the meaning of culture is very necessary. Then, the analysis of the context of the speaker or the writer is pragmatic and interpreted by the listener or the reader Yule (1996). Pragmatics, as a core of the language, is a linguistically embedded mixture of language and meaning in the structure of a language. The examination of the speaker's or writer's context is practical and interpretable by the listener or reader.

Some facial descriptions concentrate on the social context, and some on the linguistic context of interpersonal are very important to use showing face each other. The face is the optimistic public picture that you aim to build in social interactions, according to Erving Goffman (1955). According to Erving Goffman, the face is the positive public image that you want to project. Some facial descriptions focus on the social context of interpersonal communication. Cultural ideals such as dignity, virtue, guilt, and salvation, need to be connected to one's belief system.

Kienpointner says a person's closeness to others will determine how someone behaves with known and unknown people will be treated differently. One of the characteristics that determine polite behavior is social distance. (Kienpointner,1997). The degree to which a person is close to others influences how he or she interacts with both known and unfamiliar persons. Social distance is one of the factors that determine polite behavior.

Humans in this century are faced with rapid technological advances. Inter-social interactions are also increasingly widespread in social media networks, because every human being has their views, in essence, it does not dampen politeness. When it comes to using language to communicate, a person has two options: written or spoken language. (Ferguson & Thomson, 2008) Because every human being has their point of view, inter-social contacts are common in social media networks. This, in turn, does not decrease politeness. When it comes to communicating with others, a person has two choices: written or spoken language.

2.2 Types of Face Threatening Act

According to Brown and Levinson, 1987:91. There are two types of face-threatening acts from 2 different points of view, and there are speaker and hearer. Speaker have indirect speech act as positive speaker, and negative speaker. Hearer also has indirect speech act hearer positive and hearer negative. Positive and negative have their respective categories

2.2.1 Face threatening acts as the hearer's face.

A. Positive face

Face-threatening actions are a possibility and an assessment of Brown and Levinson's self-image of the listener (1987). Positive face means face to offer the listener's self-image details in others to look nice, be likable to be an attractive human being according to norms. Such things include the following:

- Disapproval
- Criticism
- Complaints
- Accusations
- Contradictions
- Disagreements

B. Negative Face

Face-threatening act limiting the personal independence of the listener that allows him to be involved, voicing the speaker's preference for the listener and anticipating Brown and Levinson's future act (1987). Negative face means face to be free, have an open schedule, some are free to enforce. Such the following ones:

- Apologies
- acceptance of a compliment
- Breakdown of physical control over body, bodily leakage, stumbling or falling clown, etc.
- self-humiliation, shuffling or cowering, acting stupid, self-contradicting
- confessions, admissions of guilt or responsibility eg, for having done or not done an act, or for ignorance of something that S is expected to know
- emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears

2.2.2 Face Threatening Acts as the speaker face

A. Positive face

A provocative facial act undermines the self-image of the speaker. The speaker makes the argument negative to him. At the time of his speech, his freedom of action was violated. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), facial actions that harm the optimistic face of the speaker may be threatened:

- Apologies
- Acceptance of a compliment
- Emotional control
- Self-humiliation
- Confession

- Emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears

B. Negative Face

The threatening act was a threat to the personal freedom of the speaker. The speaker articulates that he must do so. The Face Threatening Actions, which can endanger the negative faces of the speaker, is, according to Brown and Levinson (1987):

- Expressing thanks
- Acceptance of H's thanks or H's apology
- Excuses
- acceptance of offers
- responses to fake listener
- unwilling promises and offers

3. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Descriptive research used to gather detailed information about the current state of a phenomenon and to draw valid conclusions. Descriptive research could characterize a phenomenon's situation. It means that descriptive research would provided more information than the researcher collected the data requires. Qualitative research, on the other hand, entails delving deeper into non-numerical data. The researcher employs a qualitative approach in light of the data and the research's goal. This research used the description of the data analysis that was collected by the researcher using descriptive methods. And defined in terms of relevant data and methods in the summary. This is linked to phenomena or events that are debated in the culture and occur in the field or with sources collected by the researcher, the researcher explores this approach with qualitative

Since the words are a form of data from this study, mentioned that a qualitative approach is used to analyze an object's natural state, and with the researcher as the primary tool sugiyono(2017). This study looks at the group of constructive politeness acts did by Joe Biden and Donald Trump during the first debate of the 2020 presidential candidates for the United States of America (USA). Candidates participate in both optimistic and negative immoderate tactics.

Interpretive interpretation is pragmatic, according to expert Yule (1996), and the two speakers' comments about what they foresee and the meaning are strongly linked. This study looks at the FTA (Face Threatening Act) category listed in the first presidential debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump for the United States of America (USA).

Sample Of The Data

This section discusses the sample data, researcher had took the data sample below "the candidate for the first presidential debate of the USA (United State of America) in 2020 between Joe Biden and Donald Trump"

DONALD TRUMP: Well, first of all, I guess I'm debating you, not him, but that's okay. I'm not surprised. Let me just tell you something. There's nothing symbolic. I'm cutting drug prices. I'm going with Favored Nations, which no President dares to do because you're going against big pharma. Drug prices will be coming down 80 or 90%. You could have done it during your 47 year period in government, but you didn't do it. Nobody's done it. So we're cutting healthcare. (FTA positive speaker) recognition

DONALD TRUMP: I'll give you an example. Insulin, was destroying families, destroying people, the cost. I'm getting it for so cheap it's like water, you want to know the truth. So cheap. Take a look at all of the drugs that we're doing. Prescription drug prices, we're going to allow our Governors now to go to other countries to buy drugs because when they paid just a tiny fraction of what we do. (FTA positive speaker) recognition

Source Data

The researcher analyze this research cannot be separated from the help of several sources to be able to make the data in this study possible and based on two large media with different platforms. These are two sources of data on web pages online, and the researcher put the data detail below:

1. The researcher took the source data transcript online on web page www.dailymail.com, and the transcript data had published by daily mail in 08:15BST, 30 September 2020. This data transcript as an evidence researcher to analyze face-threatening act conversation between Joe Biden and Donald Trump on presidential debate
2. To find out video data the researcher took a video debate program between Joe Biden and Donald Trump are candidates' presidential the United States of America. The video data had published on YouTube's sky news web page as evidence audio and visuals of the debate event has taken place and broadcast online on 30 September 2020

The technique of Collecting Data

The method to collected the data, according to the theory by (Hancock &

Algozzine, 2017) first is an interview, followed by observation, a questionnaire, and the last is documentation.

1. In this study, the researcher used documentation as valid data collection from various sources.
2. The researcher saw and listened carefully to the presidential debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump on Sky news's YouTube channel.
3. The researcher read the transcript of the debate on the daily mail website.
4. The researcher used purposive sampling observation to collected the data and observational research was supported by valid data samples. The data sources that had been listed. The researcher would analyze the indirect expressions made by the presidential candidates during the debate using courtesy face-threatening acts theory by (Brown and Levinson's theory, 1987).

The technique of Analyzing Data.

The method of data analyze in this study is Brown and Levinson's theory face-threatening act. In the analyze section, the researcher would analyzed the transcript text on how the speaker and hearer respond to each other as the interlocutor in the presidential debate. The steps are as follow:

1. Collected data by looking on the web page link to the contents of the presidential debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump in the daily mail, and watched the debate video on the web page link on the YouTube Sky News
2. Analyzed indirect expressions in the presidential debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump with the FTA theory

3. Watch for indirect expressions by listened to the debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump during the debate on YouTube Sky News, then in the conversations that had quoted from the daily mail, the sections that include indirect expressions are classified.
4. Analyze the data used of the face-threatening act as a courtesy sentence by the candidates for president of the United States of America, and used as an expression indirectly with opponents in debate.
5. Uppercase the conclusion based on the data had analyzed.

4. Disscus Section

4.1 Find Out Face Threatening Act

In this section, the researcher will show the face-threatening act performed by Joe Biden and Donald Trump during the debate. This section is also related to the first questions of identification problems that would be answered in this section, and this section is according to used Brown and Levinson's 1987 theory.

Data 1

DONALD TRUMP: How are you doing?

JOE BIDEN: I'm well.

In this data, the candidates between Joe Biden and Donald Trump before initiating a first debate president United States of America with asking each other how they did. Joe Biden welcomed the speech from Trump with the indication that Biden gave a humble face, so it could be concluded that this sentence is an indirect speech act negative *expressing thanks*

Data 2

DONALD TRUMP: we have a phenomenal nominee respected by all. Top, top academic, we have a professor at Notre Dame, highly respected by all.

DONALD TRUMP: the Democrats, they wouldn't even think about not doing it. The only difference is they'd try and do it faster. There's no way they would give it up. They had Merrick Garland, but the problem is they didn't have the election so they were stopped.

Trump gets flattery from someone who says Trump is the nominee. With trump's sentence which is indicated to say that there is a sense of limiting degrading objects or other people to members of the court, and it can be concluded that the sentence uttered by trump was a negative indirect speech act accepted of compliment. Trump went on to say that the Democrats wouldn't think they would did anything because they own the Merrick Garland and they would never had the option to give up but the Democrats don't stand a chance in the election so they stopped with Trump's remarks it could be concluded that Trump has a statement that other people want. Can believe in Trump and is categorized as an indirect speech act, positive *emotional control*

Data 3

JOE BIDEN: thank you for doing this and looking forward to this, Mr. President.

DONALD TRUMP: Thank you, Joe.

Joe Biden started his debate sentence with a face-threatening act with an indication that Biden gave a humble face, so it could be categorized as negative *expressing thanks* to all parties, including Trump and Chris. Trump received a thank you from Biden by said thank you again then trump did an indirect speech act of *acceptance of a compliment*, an indication that this sentence was marked by trump before trump received a compliment from Biden.

Data 4

JOE BIDEN: ....he knows what I proposed. What I proposed is that we expand Obamacare and we increase it. We do not wipe any.

DONALD TRUMP: That's not what you've said and it's not what your party is saying.

Biden revealed that Trump knew his goal is to expand Obamacare and increase its budget and not remove existing ones. Biden's words could guarantee that his own words can be categorized as indirect speech acts positive *confession*. Trump replied to Biden's words that this is not what Biden fought for in this presidential election with this sentence that could be categorized as positive *criticism.*

Data 5

JOE BIDEN: The point is that the President also is opposed to Roe V. Wade. That's on the ballot as well and the court

DONALD TRUMP: You don't know what's on the ballot. Why is it on the ballot?

Biden responded to someone who participated on debate topic with the response that trump aimed to oppose Roe V wade and was in the voice of the highest court with Biden's remarks showing indirect speech acts in the category of positive *accusations*. Trump responded emotionally to the matter that Biden did not knew that he was in court with Trump's remarks, which led to indirect speech.

Positive *Emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears.*

4.2 Answering Second Question of Identification Problem

As the second question of identification problem from the researcher is the benefit of this research for readers. The researcher had analyzed the data and it is known that the dominance of face-threatening acts during the presidential debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump.

The whole data of debate are 61, but the researcher took some data on this journal, analyzed FTA presidential debate and this section related to the data had analyzed by the researcher. The result of Biden who dominates as a speaker in the positive and negative categories were emotional control, confession, emotion leakage, and excuses, then Biden as a hearer is dominated by the categories of criticism, complaints, accusations, contradictions, disagreements, and the negative categories as confession, emotion leakage does not always tend to be said by Biden, so this category which is dominated by emotional indicates that Biden speaks as a speaker and hearer does not tend to focus on his opponent. Trump as a speaker was dominated by confessions, emotion leakage, excuses, acceptance offers, and trump as a hearer is dominated by criticism, complaints, accusations, disagreements, confessions. Dominant as much as this includes Trump who more often interrupts than Biden the conversation with the meaning behind his words.

The benefit of this research is that readers and the next researcher can see there are two views of people argued with their respective strategies. Readers and the next researcher can see the meaning behind their expression statement or answer the question. Some argue by adopting

strategies that tended to be emotional by Biden during the debate, and Trump who used strategies that tended to focused on the opponents of the debate said the issue of privacy would be threatening Biden's face in front of the public. The different strategies used by the candidates were their strategies in the debate so that they can be elected president, besides that the debate strategies carried out by each presidential candidate could threaten the face of their debating opponents in public. The researcher advises readers not to threaten someone's face when arguing in public or privately with their closest friends, relatives, people who the readers don't know. Keep in mind other people's faces, because the debate just different views between the opposite debate and saying issue someone's privacy on the debate just making the opposite face's threatened. Humans are social creatures who need and depend on others.

After the researcher answered and explained the first and second identification problem questions. In this section, the researcher will visually analyze the data and the percentage results of Biden as a speaker, following Biden percentage results as speaker below:

Number	Kinds of Face Threatening Act Speaker Positive & Negative	Precentage
1	Apologies	0%
2	Acceptance of a compliment	0%
3	Emotional control	22%
4	Self-humiliation	0%
5	Confession	20%

6	Emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears	27%
7	Expressing thanks	2%
8	Acceptance of H's thanks or H's apology	0%
9	Excuses	22%
10	acceptance of offers	1%
11	responses to fake listener	6%
12	unwilling promises and offers	1%

In this section, the researcher will visualize the data. in this table results of Biden as a hearer's face, following percentage results revealed:

Number	Kinds of Face Threatening Act Hearer Positive & Negative	Precentage
1	Disapproval	0%
2	Criticism	17%
3	Complaints	22%
4	Accusations	22%
5	Contradictions	22%
6	Disagreements	6%
7	Apologies	0%
8	acceptance of a compliment	0%
9	breakdown of physical control over body,	0%

	bodily leakage, stumbling or falling clown, etc	
10	self-humiliation, shuffling or cowering, acting stupid, self-contradicting	0%
11	emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears	5%
12	confessions, admissions of guilt or responsibility eg, for having done or not done an act, or for ignorance of something that S is expected to know	6%

The researcher has visualized Biden as a speaker and hearer face. In this section, the researcher will visualize trump data as speaker into percentage results. Here is the percentage of trump data as speaker:

Number	Kinds of Face Threatening Ac Speaker Positive & Negative	Precentage
1	Apologies	1%
2	Acceptance of a compliment	2%

3	Emotional control	2%
4	Self-humiliation	0%
5	Confession	34%
6	Emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears	8%
7	Expressing thanks	0%
8	Acceptance of H's thanks or H's apology	0%
9	Excuses	44%
10	acceptance of offers	3%
11	responses to fake listener	2%
12	unwilling promises and offers	2%

In the next section researcher will visualize trump data as a hearer in the results of the percentage below:

Number	Kinds of Face Threatening Act Hearer Positive & Negative	Precentage
1	Disapproval	0%
2	Criticism	9%
3	Complaints	11%
4	Accusations	59%
5	Contradictions	1%
6	Disagreements	7%
7	Apologies	0%

8	acceptance of a compliment	1%
9	breakdown of physical control over body, bodily leakage, stumbling or falling clown, etc.	0%
10	self-humiliation, shuffling or cowering, acting stupid, self-contradicting	0%
11	confessions, admissions of guilt or responsibility eg, for having done or not done an act, or for ignorance of something that S is expected to know	8%
12	emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears	4%

Conclusion

In this study, the researcher aims to examine the indirect speech acts uttered by Joe Biden and Donald Trump during the first presidential debate section of the United States America 2020, and the

researcher will explain from chapter 1 until chapter 4 concisely.

1. This study used the face-threatening act theory of Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson (1987) were divided into two categories, namely speaker and hearer, and the researcher used several pragmatic theories, face-threatening act, and other supporting theories. The researcher used qualitative research methods as a guide for the researcher to analyzed this research. To collected the data researcher is using purposive sampling. The researcher had analyzed the indirect speech acts performed by the candidates for the first presidential debate in the USA. The way researcher to analysis the data viewing the meaning behind the utterance what candidates said on the debate. The data had founded out how dominant Joe Biden and Donald Trump were in utterance indirect speech acts by following the face-threatening act theory in several categories. The researcher took some most dominant utterance indirect speech acts of whole categorized FTA. The type of speaker used by Biden are 22% Emotional control data, 20% Confession data, 27% Emotion leakage data, non-control of laughter or tears. 22% on Excuses, 6% on responses to fake listener, 2% expressing thanks. And the indirect speech act analysis performed by Biden as a hearer are 17% Criticism, 22% Complaints, 22% for Accusations, 22% Contradictions, 6% Disagreements, 6% confessions, admissions of guilt or responsibility, 5% emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears.. The researcher had also analyzed the indirect speech act sentences by Donald Trump as speaker 34% Confession, 8% Emotion leakage, non-control of laughter or tears, 44% Excuses, and trump as a hearer 9% Criticism, 11% Complaints, 59% Accusations, 7% Disagreements, 8% confessions, admissions of guilt or responsibility eg, for having done or not done an act, or for ignorance of something that S is expected to know. Regarding the results of the indirect speech act data analysis of the presidential debate.

2. The benefits of this research for readers can take positive things and discard those that are not useful, although different views during the debate should not threaten someone's face. Joe Biden's dominant indirect speech act was emotional, but Trump's dominance with accusations indicated that Trump was focused on his opponent. Trump as a speaker also dominates over Biden's speech. Dominant as much as this includes Trump who more often interrupts the conversation with the meaning behind his words.

Bibliography

Fraser, B. (1990) *Perspectives on Politeness* . Journal of Pragmatics , (14) , 219 36

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson.(1987). *Politeness: Some Universal in Languagee Usage*. Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Yule, George. (1996). *An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Mey, Jacob.(1993). *Pragmatics:An Introduction*. Cambridge: Wiley Blackwell.

Goffman, E. (1955). *On Face work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements Social Interaction*. Psychiatry, 18(3):213-31.

Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (2nd ed.)*. New York: Routledge Publishers Ltd

Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.

Ferguson, A., & Thomson, J. (2008). Systemic functional linguistics and communication impairment. *The Handbook of Clinical Linguistics*, 130–145.

Hancock, D. R., & Algozzine, B. (2017). *Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning researchers*. Teachers College Press.

Hasanah, N., & Sarage, J. (2017). REQUESTING SPEECH ACT OF UTTERANCES IN OCEAN�S ELEVEN BY STEVEN SODERBERGH: A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS. *UAD TEFL International Conference*, *1*, 410–415.

Huber-Kriegler, M., L�z�r, I., & Strange, J. (2003). *Mirrors and windows: An intercultural communication textbook*. Council of Europe.

Hymes, D. (2005). Models of the interaction of language and social life: toward a descriptive theory. *Intercultural Discourse and Communication: The Essential Readings*, 4–16.

Kienpointner, M. (1997). Varieties of rudeness: Types and functions of impolite utterances. *Functions of Language*, *4*(2), 251–287.

Taylor, I. N. T. (2013). *A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF SPEECH ACTS TO REVEAL NINETEEN SIXTIES AFRICAN AMERICAN WOMEN�S OBSTACLES*. YOGYAKARTA STATE UNIVERSITY.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Sugiyono 2017,. *Metode Penelitian Kuantittaif, Kualitatif,* dan R&D Bandung : Alfabeta, CVBrown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.