

# Politeness indicators of President Duterte's speeches: A content analysis

Gomez, Dan ✉

University of Mindanao, Philippines ([dangomez031986@gmail.com](mailto:dangomez031986@gmail.com))

Manuel, Rewyn

Department of Education, Davao De Oro, Philippines ([rewynmanuel@gmail.com](mailto:rewynmanuel@gmail.com))



ISSN: 2243-7703

Online ISSN: 2243-7711

OPEN ACCESS

**Received:** 26 October 2022

**Revised:** 1 November 2022

**Accepted:** 8 November 2022

**Available Online:** 8 November 2022

**DOI:** 10.5861/ijrse.2022.366

## Abstract

Language can make or break a person. Oftentimes, a person is judged by the way he/she expresses his/her stand. This study determined the politeness strategies employed by President Duterte on his speeches and the interpretation of the audience on his politeness based on these speeches. This study used a qualitative approach specifically utilizing content analysis. It catered seven informants in the in-depth interview and seven informants in the focus group discussion. Results revealed that the President has employed all the politeness strategies on his speeches, namely: bald-on record, negative politeness, positive politeness and off-record or the indirect strategy. Findings also revealed that the interpretation of the audience on the politeness of President Duterte based on his speeches were the President give excitement to the listeners, catch the audience participation and the audience suggest appropriate reaction on the President's sensitive speeches. It is recommended that there will be more exploration on the politeness strategies of the President in different platforms wherein the audience interacts with the President.

**Keywords:** teaching English, politeness strategies, content analysis, Philippines

## **Politeness indicators of President Duterte's speeches: A content analysis**

### **1. Introduction**

The indispensable thought in the total well-being about government leaders has been tremendously adhered by the people. May it be good or bad side dominion, the constituents will react something, even in the smallest and unnecessary stuffs. Every personality of the State leaders makes them peculiar and different from every other head. Thus, there is a huge relation on how the people link themselves on the leadership of a certain chief on a particular sovereignty (Kahya & Sahin, 2018). Good leadership, proper behavior and right notion and attitudes are the integral parts on influencing people's perceptions. Besides, the heads affect mainly on how they manage the system accordingly and effectively. An expectation can be made on the quality of the leaders' personality that affects the attitudes and behaviors of the followers (Cho et al., 2017). Speaking engagements are common to government leaders since speaking in public are their prime contact to the people. And due to cultural differences, the verbal and non-verbal expressions on leaders' speeches are quite provoking and tending to fall on various aspects of politeness (Voinov, 2013).

The proper use of politeness and impoliteness strategies is closely tied to the language tool of manipulation (Slavova, 2012). In political setting, there is a constant struggle for those political leaders to communicate with their supporters. They have struggles in asserting dominance, maintaining positive relations, and asseverating a high level of aptness when it comes to proper manipulation of social interaction. Moreover, speeches tend to have these commanding utterances in which actions are done as the effect on how the speaker wants the listeners react. Thus, the illocutionary effects are more valuable, as well as the interpersonal functions of the whole texts rather than the truth value (Mara, 2015). Besides, the interpersonal functions incorporate all the usage of language to specify social and personal interactions (Sharififar & Rahimi, 2015). Three areas are in the core: speaker/writer persona, social distance, and relative social status which are useful to spoken and written texts.

The utmost challenge of every nation is the rise on the description of sociolinguistic spectacle, as to how government leaders avoid words and registers that are not totally accepted by the many. Thus, there is an enormous need of building linguistic strategies in involving or avoiding such vocabularies in all speaking engagements (Mitchell, 2015). Politicians would uplift the name and reputation of their country by doing utmost authority. This can be realized through the use of good communication of language and expressing their thoughts with standard point of politeness. (Yasmeen et al., 2014). Language must be observed with greater civility and politicians are expected to practice this. In Japan, high accounts with regards to proper decorum and politeness are highly regarded and given utmost importance by the government officials, (Yamaguchi, 2016). Korean leaders understood manners as an indication of behaving with discipline or behaving with moderation. Moreover, English populists are always mediating the polite ways of cordial conduct (Min, 2016).

Unfortunately, some world leaders have used ill-words and profanity. In fact, the 44th president of USA Barack Obama famously called Kanye West a "jackass.". However, he cemented his opinion when Rollin Stone posted his side on expressing his word "bullshitter" for the opponent Mitt Romney. Of course, other politicians have sworn. Vice President Joe Biden called the Affordable Care Act a "big fucking deal" in a moment and it is picked up by a microphone, while President George W. Bush highlighted a reporter by saying a "major-league a-hole" in another hot mic moment. Vice President Dick Cheney once told a Democratic senator to "go fuck yourself," and presidents Richard Nixon and Lyndon Johnson were notoriously profane while talking with advisors. Many American politicians have used curse words in private gatherings, but few have done so the way Donald Trump does. Trump used to say curse words at public events very often, one of those was during his campaign where he mixed his talk liberally with "damn" and "hell" and even "s— "and "p—." President Donald Trump has been the center of criticism because many believe that his language style is uncalculated, with a large amount of people even calling it "word salad" (Lakoff, 2016).

In the Philippines, the head of the State President Rodrigo Duterte reigns himself as a man in his word and he is somewhat similar to this case. He was a famous commando of crimes during his time as the mayor in Davao City. He has been described as foul-mouthed, undaunted, and fierce, (Sunday Times, 2018 June 10). Added to that, Duterte's character sketch has come by far as the bad-boy example in his country, catapulted with lack of politeness, ridicules, allegations, treats others with insolence and arrogance and wounds others' feelings with humiliation. But in the other side of the coin, he is delicate, humorous and politically sharp-witted leader. Apparently, not everybody can sail and understand the speaking style of Duterte (Sunday Times, 2018 June 10). Mara (2015) cited the works of Brown & Levinson (1987), the self-image of the listeners should be investigated through the positive and negative impressions on the speeches of the speakers. This will equalize both on the speakers' positive and negative face and to those his/her interlocutors.

Ranada (2018) mentioned in her article that President Duterte has huge amount of word metaphor. He usually uses his unique style of talking to pinpoint something about his contradictors. There is a wondrous effect when he flashes creative words and empirical statements that somehow become a shield and proof of his high authority. He is known for his foul mouth. In fact, the career diplomat and former lawmaker Leticia Ramos Shahani gave cautions to President Rodrigo Duterte to be softer on his speeches because he is highest representative of the country. In some of his speeches, when Duterte was still running for presidency, U.S. Ambassador to Manila Philip Goldberg was not exempted to his somehow below the belt remarks. Duterte called him "gay." He once called Senator Leila de Lima as an "immoral woman" and "hypocrite" was his description for the Church and even the International Criminal Court (ICC). These groups were accusing Duterte as doing wrong and hiding it in the society. As a way of rebuttal, he said that they were also hiding something about wrongdoing. Recently, he was also put into controversy when he remarked that "God is stupid."

As the president, he has to be careful with language specifically his gutter language (Billiones, 2016). He once made a promise that he will stop cursing altogether after receiving a direct order from God (Aljazeera, 2016). Despite his attempts, he could not stop himself from the use of profanity in public. This study focused on the politeness attraction in the speeches of President Duterte. There have been relatively few publications about presidents' language and speeches. However, most of the studies are done by the foreign authors using foreign research corpora. Thus, this is more impelling in the Philippines since there has been no published research about the politeness strategies used by our President in his speeches. He is known for his curse but no one made an effort to scrutinize how he applies politeness on his talks.

In this research, the politeness strategies used by our president on his speeches are dealing about human rights, church conflict and other related social issues will be the focus of the study. Politeness has been proved as one thing that needs to be observed by those high rank officials including our president. Hence, this study is designed to cater a need to analyze the used politeness strategies of our president thereby helping ordinary people and even those critics that our president has also made an effort in using politeness strategies in his talks. Furthermore, it also aims to better understand the image of our president as represented by his talks on his various speeches.

## **2. Purpose of the Study**

As Master of Education Major in English Language student of the University of Mindanao, part of the curriculum is that we are encouraged to delve into the many facets of language in the real context. Therefore, the purpose of this qualitative research employing content analysis was to describe and analyze the politeness strategies that are being used by our president on his selected speeches. Furthermore, it also aims to analyze the issues that have surfaced from his speeches and to better understand the speaking behavior of our president as represented on.

At this point of the study, I retrieved the five audio video speeches of our president from the internet. The full texts of these selected speeches were reviewed and analyzed. Most of the time, we Filipinos were keen in

observing the words of our president, especially those texts that were not in accordance to our perceptions and beliefs. This became a prevalent issue since we tended to overlook the goodness of his speeches because we were always waiting for that inappropriate words and gestures.

This content analysis was of great help in finding the good sides in the speeches of President Duterte through finding his politeness strategies that were not taken into consideration by most of the Filipino people and even foreign critics. Through this study, I personally understood the speeches of President Duterte. Honestly, though I was an avid supporter, I did not have any idea on the politeness strategies our president. I adored his impulsive style of being straightforward. This study eventually became a great help to my fellowmen so that they can see lighter light on the speeches of our president. In totality, the intention of this endeavor was to analyze deeply the speeches of President Duterte and give comprehensive interpretation on how he employs politeness strategies considering also the perspective of the audience.

## *2.1 Research Questions*

This study focused on the content analysis of the speeches of President Rodrigo Duterte. Specifically, it answered the following questions;

- What are the politeness strategies present in the speeches of President Duterte?
- How does the audience interpret politeness revealed in the intentions of President Duterte's speeches?

## *2.2 Theoretical Lens*

This study is anchored on Brown & Levinson's Universal Politeness Theory (1987) that politeness has something to do with maintenance of harmonious relationship in spite of the fact that all cultures and societies are different. Though politeness is common to all yet it differs on how it is being realized from culture to culture. This proves that politeness is a social behavior yet it is not in particular with regards to one culture or language. Thus, the essential role of politeness shall be a subject of thought, especially on the public speakers such as government chiefs.

Lakoff (1972) was the pioneering linguist who postulated the theory about the essence of politeness in interaction. She said that humans should obey set of rules when there is interaction to another human and will employ these standards to continue the interaction. Her proposition is about the two-way standards of politeness and that is talking with clarity and politeness. However, Leech (1983) had seen the possibility of being polite perceived by the speaker as it is yet it is impolite belief to the hearer, vice versa. With this, Kousar (2015) cited the reciprocation of Leech's politeness theory to the propositions of Lakoff (1972) that politeness achieves universality where the one who interacts can be negatively polite rather than embracing positive politeness. Moreover, this principle is grounded on the face of the persons or being referred to as a trade in face, whether be accredited and be delivered by other people. The speaker shall embody rationality and face in which he or she can enjoin his/her logical reasoning from ends to means to attain various ends. Neither positive nor negative, the face can be missing, kept, or enhanced, and should be integrated with other people (Kim, 2011).

On the other hand, most of the speeches are instinctively jeopardizing the hearer's or speaker's face with different phases. This is known as Face Threatening Act (Brown & Levinson, 1987) that differs from orders, petitions, propositions, advice, commitments, or compliments to criticisms, condemnation, insult or threats. If a speaker catches on that his/ her talk has an impact on changing the poker face of the audience positively or negatively, then politeness works through positive and negative politeness strategies so that the achievement of the threat decrease will be there. It depends upon the scenario whether the speaker controls to cope up the meat of the FTA or he controls the hearer's face. Then, there will be mitigation on the side of speaker to engage the threat to hearer's face. There are affiliative techniques which are composed of positive politeness strategies like being open, associative and amusing. Otherwise, circumspect strategies are having these negative politeness

strategies like for example being ambiguous, avoidant, remorseful and indirect. Other-oriented strategies are observant, distressed, seeking agreement, hopeful, approving, civil, empathic and professional (Min, 2016).

### 2.3 Significance of the Study

The moment President Duterte seated in his position as the highest commanding leader of our country, the eyes of everybody is on him. Undeniably, all the aspects in the life of our president seem to be a big deal on how he influences every Filipino. Thus, conducting this content analysis research would be relevant and beneficial for some reasons. First, this study will find out the politeness of our president in spite of his unique style of speaking. Besides, Filipino people will value more the existence of our president as the huge part of building a better nation. Then, this study can be beneficial in the academe especially teachers who are teaching Social Studies and English subjects in any schools in the Philippines and this will become a springboard for their teaching. Teachers can easily relate the notion of the speeches of our president when they fully understand and see the politeness strategies used by our president. Besides, this will be an addition to the learnings in public speaking. Next, this will be of great help so that we figure out the present politeness techniques in every speech the participant has. Lastly, this study can be a guide for future researchers who will conduct related studies emphasizing on public speaking and good governance of our leaders. This will also be a reference for other researchers who want to seek information and ideas about the leadership of our beloved President Rodrigo Duterte.

## 3. Literature review

### 3.1 Politeness

Politeness is defined as a way of how we present our 'face' otherwise known as our 'social persona' to others which exists in all cultures. This 'face' is what every interlocutor wants to protect, enhance, or improve in order to decrease the threat we give off, while at the same time, having the awareness of the 'face' of others, which varies from situation to situation depending on who we are interacting with. Any form of social interaction would be a risk to the 'face' and that it would be a risk to other people's 'face' as well as our own. Due to the fact that not everyone comes from the same city or province, our social norms will not all be the same since others are raised in different cultural backgrounds (Goffman, 1967). The utilization of language, behavior, and gesture showcases in showing an optimistic self-portrait is important in the society. Speakers want to have an impression. It may be displaying competence with consciousness or being supportive to the desires of others. Our face is the best showcase in the world stage especially when we want to build a positive social worth. The face is primarily the mirror of anybody's value and will lead to the enhancement of self-esteem, self-identity and credibility as one of the individuals in the society (Sagaravasi, 2012).

Goffman's (1967) politeness theory in the idea about the face which means as an image of self, portrayed through the approval of society. Naturally, we tend to protect our feeling good face through controlling our emotional attachments. The detachments of this inner emotions can be the way of engaging ourselves into face saving strategies (Maginnis, 2011). In the study that positive and negative faces universally thrive in humans. Basically, the maintenance of speaker's and hearer's faces shall be through the cooperation of any rational person. However, this is not happening at all times wherein during the any form of communication, the face threatening acts are somehow unavoidable (Peng et al., 2012).

These two types of faces which were introduced by Brown & Levinson (1987). Positive face is therefore positively social individual as of you presented yourself very well, thus, this is what you want to be perceived by others as being you. While the negative face is about the assertion of yourself from your personal assessment to freedom. Sometimes, a positive face will be perceived by another person as negative face, vice versa. A concrete example for that is when a person possesses a happy face always, then suddenly, that person becomes moody and snobs at someone, so that individual transgress his positive face and therefore be concluded by others as unhappy. On the other side, a negative face prevails the notion that people want to do what they wanted to do. An example

for this is when the speaker wanted to let the audience stay though his time of speaking is already over. Besides, other citing that threatens negative face are requests, threats, commands, questions, suggestions, and advice (Maginnis, 2011).

### 3.2 Politeness Strategies

A polite person is dealing his/her politeness as a character. It is not about the language he/she uses, but the mere fact that it is his/her behavior. The manners and the behavior of the speaker are the factors as to how he/she is being judged by the society or may it be on the language usage wherein the hearer's perception will be identified either more or less polite. Every nation has always had different culture when talking about the politeness of speakers. For these cultural differences can lead the hearers of perceiving the expressions of certain speakers as peculiar, strange, or even a taboo, since they are not used to it and even unfamiliar to the gestures and politeness markings of those speakers (Friginal & Hardy, 2014). The substantiality on the pedagogy of linguistic politeness has been widely accepted as to the usage of controlled language to avoid misunderstanding and to build a long-lasting relationship with utmost optimism through careful consideration on the various face of humans (Wapee, 2018). In the study entitled Politeness devices in the Tuvan language that Brown & Levinson's paper "Universals in Language usage: Politeness phenomena" was the most influential and widely used politeness research theory in the world because the applicability of this strategies is crossing borders in the entire globe (Voinov, 2013).

Speech performances of any speaker are often evaluated by critics such as linguists through basing it to a certain theory. One of those is politeness theory. The very reason for this critique is the query as to how and why humans do individual way of interacting in the society through engaging the standards of various cultures and the maintenance and supporting good social relations (Wu, 2014). The essence of human equality with respect to social, political, and economic affairs and the proximity of rising control with the organization. There must be an explanation as to how the frequently observable disagreements emerge in a certain workplace. Though it happens that the encouragements as to behave with egalitarianism, still the speech levels and actual behaviors are changeable from time to time among subordinates and superiors. Thus, politeness might show certain authoritarian relations (Morand, 2014).

The alleviation of possible damage to the 'face', the speaker must apply the various politeness strategies through evaluating the Face Threatening Acts with interconnecting factors of authority, space, and imposition ranking of an FTA in a certain culture, ranging from less polite to the politest technique (Brown & Levinson, 1978, cited by Kousar, 2015). Speakers should account the hearers' feelings and desires when doing a certain action of speaking. Politeness arises through expressing it verbally or non-verbally. Therefore, it can be perceived towards the intention of having an appropriate dressing, proper facial expressions, hand movements and body postures. Besides, it can also be shown through the speakers' usage of linguistic forms of a particular language. This has an important role in communication since it regulates the cooperative behavior to maintain harmony between the speakers and the listeners (Al-Duleimi et al., 2016).

Evidently, politeness' vitality in government officials' public speaking engagements is a thing to be observed. During the delivery of speech, speakers might voice out utterances as a way of communicating the audience well. Thus, the strategy must have the politeness which is appropriate to the situation among speaker and the listeners. In a big crowd like municipal, city or even national affairs, politeness is a need since rudeness and other bad utterances might create an impression that continually arise wherever that speaker might have speaking time (Santosa, 2018). In addition, the static manner of politeness can be shown its predictability through a subordinate-chief executive relationship as for example wherein basically the subordinate will show politeness to his head. However, the dynamism of politeness will arise like when a certain subordinate feels confident because of a successful and productive endeavor or in contrast manner, the head with apply consideration and friendly way. With this politeness strategies, perceptions of various communicative dynamics can be understood (Morand, 2014).

Basing on the politeness principle adhered in the study citing that speaker will handpick whatever politeness strategy to show consciousness in another person's face. With this assertion, as speakers, they choose suitable politeness strategy the moment they get the persons' faces (Teng, 2015). The vitality of linguistic self-awareness can also be achieved because our words can extend across the thinking of the people, hence, speech is somehow automatic, though in some time, the strive to thrive communication has been done, yet the tendency to forget how do speakers handle and utter words with various meaning to the hearers. Therefore, awareness of face, and so with the understanding when and how to best threaten face, or avoidance to it is the possible remedy to gain best perceptions and comprehension (Morand, 2014).

In the study entitled *Team Identity and Politeness: An Analysis of the University of the Philippines Diliman Student Council Election Standard Bearers' Speech in Philippine Collegian Interviews*, she noted that there is distinctiveness in every culture and social group when talking about politeness because it is a tenor of speaking in line with the rules in conducting speech. Besides, she said that there are four frames of reference when touching the supposition on the approach of politeness (Amper, 2018). Brown & Levinson's (1987) Face Threatening Act with five possible techniques namely: Bald on Record Politeness, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, Off Record Politeness and Don't do FTAs. When the hearer's face is threatened more, the speaker will employ the higher politeness strategy (Maginnis, 2011).

### *3.3 Bald on Record Politeness*

The other term for this politeness strategy is without redressive act. This has something to do when someone will present a certain idea that can obviously be attributed as face threatening. Thus, you have to choose as whether redress or bald on. If you process with redress, then, the seeking of reviving the circumstance through reasoning out or do it with an apology. However, if someone will choose the bald on, therefore, that someone is giving more priority on efficiency over face saving actions and he/she will say the reaction clearly and say nothing else. Bald on strategy has been conventionally perceived as inappropriate, thus, conclusion and judgement towards that someone will arise as the consequence of the intentions (Maginnis, 2011). Nevertheless, there are instances that bald on is foresighted a socially applicable. The audience will accept it, not to like it but only accept it. The threat to face is primarily small. An example for this is when an individual has a greater power than the other. When a head says he needs something on a particular day and time, and the individual with lesser power responds "okay", still, this is not the best option of showing authority though that situation is sighted as acceptable in the society. This strategy is making Face Threatening Act as the most direct, vivid and the very evident process (Kousar, 2015). Moreover, bald on record is also applied when the action is adhered to someone who is famous or commonly known by the speaker. The familiarity is called "weightiness" where there is small in the situation; the FTA gives the hearer benefits and interest; when the most direct path will be used when a difference in power in terms of powerful interactants. Otherwise, making actions with redressive action will somehow decrease the threat on the face with the utilization of innovations and add-ons like the usage of the word "please". Redressive action is also specified into two types which are positive politeness and negative politeness (Said, 2011).

The suppositions of Brown & Levinson (1978:1987) that this bald-on record has this straightforwardness and on point disagreement disregarding retaliation or alleviation to lighten the words. Besides, blunt disagreement undergoes a confrontation phase or the speaker maintains his/her counter-position. This could be done because the speaker has contradictory views on the former propositions of his/her interlocutors. The usage of verb resolution such as 'insist', contradicting symbols, and one-paragraph statement prove to be pointing out in this bald on record politeness (Sagaravasi, 2012). The purpose of bald on record strategies is not about threat minimization to the hearer's face and these are utilized to directly address the other person to show his/her needs. The use of imperative forms is an anecdote of bald on record. Besides, the mitigation devices such as 'please' can soften the command or request (Adel et al., 2016).

Bald on-record is showcasing information to the hearer in which you make it obvious that your intention is

to be face threatening towards that hearer (Maginnis, 2011). It is direct and is more on efficiency over satisfying the face wants of the audience, which means that speaker shows the information in a vivid way and detailed manner without saying anything in addition. Scenarios are present in which bald on-record statements or comments are widely accepted by the people because of considering them as socially appropriate (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Another situation for the bald on record assertion, propositions and comments is the adopted appropriate when there is clarity in power of longer space between the speaker and the hearer. As a whole, the bald on record strategy for FTA are not commonly entrusted because it seems very quick and surprising which would do hearers think that one is only joking, (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The usage of bald on-record politeness strategy is visible when there is small threat to face of the audience, just as in the phrases “come in and sit down” or scenes when the speaker has higher authority than the hearer, just like the parent-child relationship where the parent tells as stop complaining. The central proposition for the speakers opting to use the bald on-record strategy is that speakers want to realize the FTA with maximum level more than they would want to give satisfaction to the hearer’s face. The use of bald on-record strategies differs in various situations. It depends on the speaker’s motivations and adds circumstances where the face threat is not minimized and those where the minimization of the face threatening act is done through implication (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Bald on record has two types when it comes to applying it. The first is not minimizing the danger in the face in which other demands override face concerns. The agreement between the speaker and the hearer is giving relevance on the face demands that might be lost if there is precedence and interest. This technique is widely used in circumstances in which speaker’s deep closeness is visible between the audience. On the other hand, FTA-oriented bald on record usage is accustomed to face, (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Thus, there is mutual orientation on the participants’ undertakings to see what another participant is wanting to see (Kurniatin, 2017). Non-minimization of the face threat has eight strategies, such as: maximum efficacy; emphatic metaphorical urgency; metaphorical urgency for higher level of valuing hearer’s friendship, channel noise circumstances; task paradigmatic formula of instruction; power different between speaker and hearer (speaker is higher); sympathetic advice or warnings; and permission that H has requested. Below are the details of each strategy. Below are the subcategories as proposed by Brown & Levinson (1987):

*Maximum efficiency.* This refers to consciousness of speaker and hearer where face redress is not a requirement. It means urgent or desperate, the redress tends to decrease the urgency of communication. Besides, the usage of direct command is commonly happening in an emergency situation. It is used when efficiency is very more essential than saving other’s face.

*Metaphorical urgency for emphasis.* This denotes when speaker talks as if getting the maximum efficiency is highly essential. Then, the emphatic metaphorical urgency presents. Attention-getting words are nice examples being used during casual talks.

*Metaphorical urgency for high valuation of hearer’s friendship.* This way sets out the reason of orders and begging having inverted postulations on common state of Speaker and Hearer. This seems to happen in languages with the same shallow syntax like imperatives.

*Case of channel noise.* This usually transpires when communication adversities manipulate pressure to speak in utmost efficacy. This can be done in a form of calling someone across a distance.

*Task oriented way of instruction.* With this interaction, face redress will be unimportant. The focus of interaction is in a form of giving a task or giving an order.

*Power different between (S) speaker and (H) hearer (S is higher).* This is seen if the differences between speaker (S) and hearer (H) are present. It could be S is more powerful than H and has no bothering of retribution or no cooperation from H. S does not have to innovate his expression to alleviate H’s face.



*Sympathetic advice or warnings.* In this strategy, speakers do care about hearers, thus, there is hearers' positive face and that does not require redress. This can be done by giving warning to someone that could threaten him or it can be in a form of giving advice or comforting someone with an advice.

*Permission from hearer's request.* When you grant the permission of the hearer's request, baldly on record might happen if we based it on Brown & Levinson postulation. This simply means speaker allows the hearer to do something.

The FTA oriented bald on record utilization is classified into three strategies, namely: welcoming, farewell, and offers. The usage of welcoming is when the speaker persists hearer may try to have his/her negative face. The farewell is used when the hearer might violate on his/her positive face when he/she leaves. The offer is used if speaker persists that the hearer might make on speaker's negative face, (Brown & Levinson, 1987). With this bald on record, the speaker can have the following advantages: he/she can get credits for being honest; the hearer can perceive the speaker is not a manipulator; the speaker's trust will be felt by the addressee; and the addressee can conceivably and easily get the speaker's purposes so that the misconceptions of information can be avoided, (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

### 3.4 Positive Politeness

It is identified as integral exemplification as the familiar behavior that points out the solidarity between interlocutors (Voinov, 2013). Positive politeness is intended on the side of hearer's positive face, his ceaseless desideration that his wants must be thought as beneficial and advantageous. Through utilizing positive politeness strategies, both the speaker and hearer communicate and considering themselves as co-operators with mutual grounds. There is a wider scope than negative politeness. Negative politeness strategies are utilized to remove a distinctive threat as observed in utterance. However, the positive politeness strategies have the involvement of compliments or jokes in the communication without alleviating a particular face threat. If the speaker has a positive face in his entire speech, the social distance would be reduced and there is weakening of possible FTA (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

This strategy will threaten positive face of an individual. For instance, if an official in the government will want someone to be met to talk about his/her work performance, just merely saying about the work evaluation is face threatening. Hence, the official could say to someone he/she is excellent but a bit of a problem arises. The decrease of face threatening will be transformed into sympathy highlighting that both are part of the conversation (Brown & Levinson, 1978, cited by Maginnis, 2011). This strategy is in favor to the hearers' positive face. The speaker's act is to revitalize the listeners' positive face through showcasing the speaker's interest to the hearer. Therefore, mutual understanding, finding better agreement, employing sympathy to the hearer and giving the desires of the hearer are some of the concrete examples if applying this technique. The speaker wants to be friendly and close to the hearer through the utilization of the words such as 'we' and 'us' in his/ her speech. With this consolation, the speaker can expect a positive face to the hearer (Kousar, 2015).

The apology as an example has been supported by some sociologists on the side of positive politeness because the speaker's positive face will create a good mood to the hearer not minding on whatever criticisms he/she might have to the hearer (Kousar, 2015). If the speaker will apologize wholeheartedly, the goal of being noticed, respected by the hearer will be achieved. The conflict free relationship will be restored. The speaker concentrates to the positive face wants of the addressee, thus there is a friendly manner between speaker and hearer in the positive politeness strategies (Meyerhoff, 2011). The prime aim of the positive politeness strategy is to build understanding and intimate space between speaker and hearer which would eventually work out a friendly relationship between them (Song, 2012).

Positive politeness is categorized into fifteen sub-strategies; acknowledging the hearer, exaggeration, deepening the interest to the listeners, usage of in-group identity marker, finding agreement, avoidance of disagreement, assertion of common ground, joking, assertion of the speaker's knowledge and concern for the

benefit on the face wants of hearer, offer or promise, optimism towards the audience, the speaker and hearer's participation in an activity, reasons' asking and giving, reciprocal assumption or assertion, and giving hearer's reward reinforcement (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The following illustrates the positive politeness strategies presented by Brown & Levinson (1987):

*Acknowledging the hearer's interest, wants and needs.* The speaker must know and be aware of the condition and state of the hearer. This can be done by making it seem like that the hearer wants the speaker to notice about them.

*Exaggeration.* The strategy tells that the speaker should highlight their statement by adding accentuating modifiers to show their interest to the hearer. This wants to show approval and sympathy with the hearer and mostly acted with exaggeration of intonation, stress and other prosodics, and so with the enhancement of English modifiers.

*Deepening the interest to the hearer.* The strategy is done when the speaker brings the hearer into the middle of the story as if the hearer was part of the story. This can be observed by using tag-questions or expressions.

*Use of in-group identity marker.* Through the utilization of any countless ways to hand over in-group membership, speaker could intimately claim mutual ground with hearer that is carried by that definition of the group. The strategy tells that the speaker uses various in-group address forms, several languages or dialects, jargon or slang, and even ellipsis.

*Finding agreement.* The strategy shows that the speaker saves the positive face of the hearer by finding ways to agree with the hearer such as lifting of safe topics or through repetition. It is about seeking possible topics wherein the speaker and hearer can agree and to stick to the topics.

*Avoidance of disagreement.* The strategy implies that the speaker appears to be agreeing to the hearer or to hide the disagreement or by using conclusory markers. Hence, speaker is always adhering the hearer in the communication procedure. Therefore, topics which cause disagreement are avoided.

*Assertion of common ground.* The strategy implies that the speaker has this point of friendship with the hearer by having time and effort with the hearer. This includes integrating about unrelated topics to show that the speaker has this utmost interest to talk with to hearer.

*Joking.* Brown & Levinson (1987) stated that joking makes the hearer at ease because those jokes come from common thoughts, same background and values. It is a fundamental positive-politeness technique in bearing hearer's confidence. Joking is done because of familiarity.

*Assertion of speaker's knowledge of and concern for the hearer's face wants.* This explains that the speaker knows what the hearer's wants are, in order for the speaker to pressure the hearer to cooperate with them. In terms of important matters, the cooperation of speaker and addressee is present. The sharing of the same goals in several topics is there. They cooperate to themselves which compensates the hearer's positive wants.

*Offer or Promise.* The strategy speaks that the speaker claims what the hearer wants and will help to get it. It wants to show that the speaker has a good intention to meet the expectations of the positive face wants of the hearer.

*Optimism.* The strategy implies that the speaker assumes what the hearer wants the speaker wants and will help obtain them, hoping the speaker and the hearer will cooperate with each other because they both have the same frame of interests. Speaker assumes that hearer will cooperate committedly and foresees the hearer to cooperate to him as well.

*The participation of speaker and hearer in an activity.* The strategy sees to it that the speaker uses an inclusive 'we' form such as 'Let's', when the speaker really means 'you' or 'me'. This strategy includes both

speaker and hearer in the activity.

*Giving or asking for reasons.* This strategy tells that the speaker asks and gives reasons about the hearer's wants in order for the hearer to be part in the speaker's activity usually by using the term 'why don't' or 'why not'. The goal of the speaker as to why and what he wants is reasonably spoken in order to imply and assume cooperation from the hearer. This fact leads to test hearer and tells if the hearer is cooperative.

*Assuming or Asserting reciprocity.* This strategy depicts that the speaker claims cooperation with the hearer by giving evidence of reciprocal rights or obligations. Claiming cooperation means providing hearer sorts of evidences to convince him/her.

*Giving rewards to the hearer.* This strategy states that the speaker satisfies the hearer's positive face by giving them a token of appreciation, not by giving something materialistically. This can be realized by doing something for the hearer such as the wants to be admired, like, listened to, understood or cared about.

The speaker utilizes positive politeness strategies because he/she could cope up hearer's positive face, with some respect (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Added to that, we can observe the intimate relationship between both parties. The positive politeness implication draws a high danger for a pain when there is rejection. With this, a speaker finds way to know someone from the audience to make courtesy. Various gains can be gotten by the speaker if he employs positive politeness just like minimizing the face threatening variable of an act through telling with guarantee that the addressee and speaker are in the same kind, liking each other and wanting each other. A speaker can also highlight his/her topic in a friendly manner; he also avoids debt implications of FTA like request and offers; and lastly, there is equality on both sides between the benefits they can get from each other (Kurniatin, 2017).

### 3.5 Negative Politeness

It is being dubbed by Brown & Levinson (1987) as the core of respect behavior where social distance between interlocutors are given a huge emphasis (Voinov, 2013). This strategy is focusing to satisfy hearer's negative face. The hearer wants to attain his/her declarations of territory and self-determination. Through this strategy, the speaker has the desire of respecting and considering the hearer's rights to being freed. The speaker's mitigation on the FTA through being indirect, being pessimistic, lesser use of imposition, the presence of apologizing, and the usage of hedging and questioning, (Brown & Levinson, 1978). Therefore, this pushes to universal adherence of saying that the hearer chooses to have peace and self-determination more than the speaker's intentions (Kousar, 2015).

With this strategy, a negative face threat will surface and frequently together with an apology like "I feel so sorry to interrupt yet..." A leader can alleviate the face threat through an act of respect. Escape much assumptions on the situations that requires queries and barriers. Thus, a person must converse with the desire to not to collide in utilizing apologies. In spite the fact that various choices could be employed in presenting FTAs, considering the face should always be there (Maginnis, 2011). The direct statement of apology, commendation of responsibility and downgraders are concrete examples of negative politeness. Kousar (2015) cited the thoughts of Holmes (1990) that the making of apologies is intended to offended's face. With this action, the restoration of good relationship between the offended and the apologizer will be attained.

Kousar (2015) added that when he studied the Urdu speakers, they are fond of using negative politeness through saying complimentary words, paying thanks and opening suggestions. The following illustrates the negative politeness strategies presented by Brown & Levinson (1987):

*Being conventionally indirect.* The strategy implies that the speaker tries to be indirect but at the same time going on-record to the hearer by saying sentences or phrases that have an ambiguous meaning in order to avoid imposing the hearer. To be conventionally indirect also means being pessimistic in which the speaker assumes

the hearer not doing any act or does not like the will to do something.

*Questioning or Hedging.* It is not the description of this strategy to presume or pressure the hearer. This is done by asking questions or using hedges. Brown & Levinson (1987) postulates hedges as a particle, word, or phrase. It modifies the level of membership of a predicate or noun phrase. Partial is the other for this. To utilize this strategy, the speaker must use particle, word and sentences and it marked by word of sort of, pretty, quite, a regular, and rather.

*Being pessimistic.* The strategy denotes that the speaker's want is obtained by expressing doubt to avoid the hearer's negative face wants. Pessimism is done when making indirect question or request which has insertion of negative probability operator. Pessimism is employed by the speaker when he showcases his doubt to the hearer through questioning the hearer possibility. This is marked by can, could, would, might, will, and may.

*Minimizing the imposition.* The strategy explains that the speaker avoids coercing the hearer by indirectly paying the hearer deference. It is used when the speaker applies several words like a tiny, little, a bit, or a taste.

*Giving deference.* The strategy implies that the speaker humbles and lowers himself. It focuses on raising the hearer by treating him/her as a superior or with a higher social status with the use of titles or address forms.

*Apologizing.* The strategy tells that the speaker showcases reluctance of impinging the hearer's negative face by partially redressing the impingement. The realization of this act is made when the feeling of regret is present to the inner self of the speaker when some mistake or damage is done. Through this way, the speaker can include their reluctance to impinge on hearer negative face and therefore partially absolves that impression.

*Impersonalizing the speaker and the hearer.* The strategy expounds that the speaker does not do to impress the hearer by avoiding the usage of pronouns I and You. It is as if the addresser is not the speaker and the addressee is not the hearer.

*Stating the face threatening act as a general rule.* The strategy implies that the speaker's aspiration is not impinge the hearer by stating the face threatening act but is forced to because of the situation the speaker is in. These face threatening acts can be universalized as a social rule, regulation or obligation with the avoidance of the use of pronouns.

*Nominalizing.* The strategy sees that the speaker replaces the verb or adjective into a noun in a sentence. It aims to show a degree of formality and to be politer towards the hearer.

*To go on-record as bringing down a debt or as not recognizing the hearer.* The strategy implies that the speaker accepts their indebtedness towards the hearer. The speaker asks the hearer for something from the hearer or disclaims any indebtedness of the hearer.

Negative politeness discloses the common understanding under respectful attitude. Besides, Western culture has linked the common sense definition to other culture. This is specific and focused all the time because it minimizes the imposition of a specific FTA directly and is not applied freely in communication the way positive politeness is (Brown & Levinson, 1987). As a conclusion, negative politeness highlights the hearer right of autonomy. The freedom to deliver his negative responses. As a result, although the audience declines the speaker's want, the influence is not over pain since negative politeness provides a chance for the listener to carry a negative answer. The speaker can get some benefits. He can recompense respect; the amiability to the addressee in return for the FTA; he can maintain social distance; avoidance of the threat; discounting the mutual face loss; and he can include the implication he has the other's face want in his mind (Kurniatin, 2017).

### 3.6 Off Record Politeness

Making clues and sarcasm when giving information and builds up face threatening in a certain situation is Off Record politeness. Nevertheless, it is an escape goat of doing it without the accountability. Someone will be

at the tone of the topic yet when approached seems to be defensive. The idea of tone is connected with the word meaning proposed by Searle (1965) and Austin (1962). When the circumstance needs it to be faced in public, to escape the direct confrontation, this strategy will be employed as if detraction can be done in the future (Maginnis, 2011).

Besides, the utilization of giving clues, application of metaphors and state of ambiguity is the prime anecdotes of off-record politeness (Kousar, 2015). Another example that implies off-record politeness is when the speaker uses rhetorical questions. This rhetorical question is perceived that does no aim of any response or answer, since the speaker doesn't want the information providence will be coming from the hearer. Thus, the answer is implied to the speaker's speech, of course, inferential understanding must be employed (Sagaravasi, 2012). The use of rhetorical question in an off-record politeness to preserve the hearer's face.

Off-record is displaying information indirectly and mostly in a declarative way, in which the speaker does a face-threatening act but does not want to be responsible for doing that face-threatening act, but instead, leaves it to the audience to do the decision in interpreting the statements (Nisa, 2014). The main goal of the off-record strategy is for the hearer to accept the statement of the speaker and to give a response, in which the speaker would come at as not demanding and not forceful, and the hearer cooperates (Safitri, 2015). Off-record strategy is categorized into fifteen sub-strategies; giving hints, giving association clues, presuppose, understate, overstate, use tautologies, use contradictions, be ironic, use metaphors, use rhetorical questions, be ambiguous, be vague, over-generalize, displace the hearer, and be incomplete by using ellipsis (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The following illustrates off-record politeness strategies presented by Brown & Levinson (1987):

*Giving hints.* It implies that the speaker states something that is not important. The interpretation of the statement of the speaker is left to hearer.

*Giving association clues.* This denotes speaker's statement needs an action from the hearer. It leaves the hearer to take up the responsibility for the face threatening act.

*Presuppose.* The strategy states presupposition of the speaker to the hearer that he has already done a certain act before with the use of the word 'again'. This serves as reminding the hearer.

*Understate.* The strategy implies that the speaker says something less from what the speaker actually wants to say. This is in a form of saying something less than what is required or more than is required to avoid complimenting or admitting.

*Overstate.* The strategy implies that the speaker's utterances is exaggeration. It is saying something more than what is enough and necessary.

*Use tautologies.* The strategy denotes that the speaker inspires the hearer to look for information in a non-informative utterance of the speaker. It also includes the stating of the same thing twice in different words, generally considered to be a fault of style.

*Use contradictions.* The strategy implies that the speaker says two things that oppose each other. This leads the hearer to interpret what the statement of the speaker means.

*Be ironic.* The strategy denotes that the speaker utters the opposite of what he/she wants to convey. Everything is up to the hearer to comprehend what the statement of the speaker means.

*Use metaphors.* The strategy says that the speaker uses a metaphor. It is also up to the hearer to interpret what the speaker actually means.

*Use rhetorical questions.* The strategy explains that the speaker asks questions without expecting an answer to the hearer. This simply means that the speaker asks questions to the hearer without aiming of the containment an answer. A rhetorical question is a device that is utilized to convince or subtly influence the audience. It is a

question asked not for the answer, but for the effect. Oftentimes, it is used to emphasize a certain point or just to get the audience think of something.

*Be ambiguous.* The strategy implies that the speaker's statement is comprehensible because there is more than one meaning to it. The ambiguity in the utterance makes the hearer to think what the speaker really meant.

*Be vague.* The strategy implies that the speaker's utterance lacks in detail. It leaves the interpretation from the hearer on the meaning of the speaker's statements.

*Over-generalize.* The strategy implies that the speaker's utterance gives a choice to the hearer. The hearer has to think if the general rule is applied or it is not.

*Displace the hearer.* The strategy implies that the speaker addresses the face threatening act and wants it at a third-party who would not be threatened. This strategy hopes that the main subject of the face threatening act will realize that utterance of the speaker is aimed at them and not really the third-party.

*Be incomplete by using ellipsis.* The strategy implies that the speaker does not complete the utterance and leaves the face threatening act half done. Ellipsis is the act of leaving out one or more words that are not necessary for a phrase to be understood.

The success or failure of the off-record politeness strategies can be either due to the fact that it only denotes to the signals. But it can be successfully applied if the speaker is using them in dominance. The utterance could be non-verbal or verbatim that does not pinpoint to the purpose directly. The benefits a speaker can have out of this strategy are the following: avoidance of joining the gossip biography that others keep him; avoidance of responsibility for possible face-damaging interpretation; delivering the addressee a chance to know that the speaker cares; and getting appreciation for the generosity and cooperation (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The off-record strategy is the safest among the others because it uses hints and clues, under and over statement, irony and rhetorical questions (Shing, 2012).

### 3.7 Don't Do FTA Politeness

This is the last strategy where no politeness is being used by the speaker (Maginnis, 2011). As a summary of the five-politeness strategy of Brown & Levinson, an individual can be observed in these examples. The bald on record is the least polite of all the five because a person is only stating his/her message very plainly, like, 'give me the phone'. The next which is the positive politeness is showcasing respect, like 'my lovely daughter, would you give my phone'? The third strategy which is the negative politeness is an individual is involving imposition, like, 'I know you are doing something but would you give me my phone'? The fourth is off-record wherein you are indirect of wanting of something, like, 'it is boring when my gadget isn't with me'. And the final strategy is not saying the message at all (Maginnis, 2011).

The abovementioned literature and studies strongly confirm the existence of politeness in man's utterances. These strategies are manifested in man's verbal and nonverbal reactions. Furthermore, these politeness strategies can be classified into bald-on strategies, positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record. Apparently, these strategies may lead to different interpretation from the audience. The presentations and discussions of related studies provided invaluable information about politeness strategies which will be beneficial in the professional discussion of the findings of the study and in the sound formation of the recommendations.

## 4. Method

**Research Design** - It is in qualitative research design employing the content analysis approach in order to identify the politeness strategies utilized and uttered by our President Duterte. Lestari et al. (2018) expounded qualitative research as to having a goal which is to describe a certain situation. Besides, it refers to basing on the description data where it does not use any statistics process. Observation and analysis were used in getting data.

The participants did the listening and viewing of the five selected speeches of President Duterte. After that, I transferred the speeches from video into transcriptions so that the participants employed better and more vivid analysis. Then the data analysis followed through basing President Duterte's utterances on politeness strategy by Brown & Levinson (1987). Documents, and observations can be used as bases through critical reading and rereading of information. These suggested procedures may give solutions of such inquiry that can be used to the formulation of universal results of an event, situation or experience and would let the researcher stands on a comprehensive way of embracing the essence of such phenomenon (Creswell, 2013).

Content analysis referred to an approach which evaluates audio-video with written materials comprehensively, then there was separation of formulated assessment implored in such specific criteria so that it provided gathered data and subjected for future study utilization (Dincer, 2018). When the analysis and observation was done, three steps of data analysis followed. First, the data reduction started in which I examined, selected, and trimmed down the politeness strategy used by President Duterte during his public speaking engagements from general strategies to specific strategies to build the various themes. Then, Duterte's utterances were judged based on Brown & Levinson's politeness theory. Next, the data display was shown through matrix so that there was easier understanding. Then, the concluding part followed wherein there was decision as to whether essential information was answered through the research questions (Lestari et al., 2018).

As a researcher, keen observation and precautionary measures must be evident in doing the analysis. Drawing comparisons and seeking similarities of the various understanding of speeches of President Duterte might be subject for extraction. Then, I tried to understand the audiences' thoughts on what were their views about politeness strategies of the president (Ariola & Buendia, 2013).

**Role of the Researcher** - My principle in life is to support whoever credible leaders will lead the country for betterment. President Rodrigo R. Duterte is one of the best examples. I am always struck both positively and negatively with the way he does his speech performances. In this case, I was very eager and interested to study the public speaking style of President Duterte specifically his politeness strategies in spite of the fact that he had a straightforward inclination. The broad framework of language especially in public speaking made me realize to study the one of the most influential leaders in the country and in the world today. And this study centered only the contents of his speeches.

I transcribed, translated, and analyzed his speeches with some contribution from the selected audience whom I considered as the participants of my study. According to Skukauskaite (2012) that analyzing must be taken into serious consideration not just a mere part of the research procedure because this became gigantic basis when employing a content analysis study. Regarding my basic principles in conducting this study, I followed the rules in the qualitative research inquiry, wherein researchers must be committed on data gathering and data analysis since doing a study like this, needs utmost time and effort. I must be the transcriber primarily, the analyst and the encoder. As a documenter, I have this innate connection with regards to this study since I am an English subject teacher, and one of the topics found in the curriculum of Kto12 program is the public speaking. The president's speeches were concrete examples so that students could also see and identify his politeness strategies.

**Research Corpora and Participants** - President Rodrigo Roa Duterte's speeches were the main subject of this content analysis study. Krippendorff (2004) defined content analysis as the organized reading of certain words, pictures, and other symbolism and does not need to have author's or user's side. Apart from my analysis as a researcher, an in-depth interview and focus group discussion were conducted to selected participants. Politeness strategies are mastered by those who are graduates of Master of Arts in Education major in English and Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics. They were asked to analyze the selected speeches of President Duterte. Hence, those who don't have the abovementioned qualifications were not included in the study for they were found difficulty in answering questions which dealt about politeness strategies. This aimed to lessen subjectivity. The use of triangulation strengthened the outcome of the study.

The concern of this study was to analyze the contents of the five speeches (corpora), as to whether he employed or not any politeness strategies suggested by Brown & Levinson (1987). The type of corpora used for this qualitative study fell under the Speech-Corpus, in which it was a collection of text transcripts (Patel & Kopparapu, 2015). Therefore, these speeches were utilized as corpora or large data sets in the method of corpus linguistics. This helped in finding the forefront evidences in the patterns used by the president in his speeches. Then the discussion of corpus lexicography was identified to find out the historical patterns of usage that had prevalent semantics. Next, the identification of collocates or neighboring words were done to get method of contextual disambiguation (Solum, 2018).

**Data Collection** - I did the following procedure in order for me to collect data and gather important information regarding my study. First, I talked to my adviser on what was the entire process of my research. In this qualitative research study, the data gathered were from YouTube. It was a challenging task for me since I needed to find the full video of the five selected speeches of President Duterte which dealt about the different social issues like human rights, illegal drugs and corruptions. President Duterte had been one of the most influential persons in the country and most of the people observed his unusual way of public speaking, and it was very timely that is why I chose his speeches in this endeavor. This research steered to know the politeness strategies as used our President when talking about social issues like human rights, illegal drugs and corruptions on his speeches. Thus, I needed to save those videos of five selected speeches of President Duterte. All the saved data were transcribed, translated, collated and were scrutinized using the theory of Brown & Levinson (1983).

In realizing this study, a laptop or computer with video player and speaker were used to get necessary evidences because the written information, together with the facial expressions and other gestures were really needed. In today's age of any endeavor, computers and laptops were important tool in videos because it gave sufficient and comprehensive examples. Thus, it became an anchor for the study through the strong points in finding the speeches of the participant. Another important device which was useful on the study is the speaker. This device gave clearer audio-voice recording; thus, it played another important role in gathering information. The utilization of these devices was of great help in justifying the research itself. The presentation, transcription and discussion of the results were done and taken into account. Part of the procedure in collecting the data was to scrutinize and categorize the five selected speeches which were held by the President. Those speeches dealt human rights, illegal drugs, corruptions and other social problems. These speeches underwent a content analysis.

**Data Analysis** - Qualitative research involves willful use for description, explanation, and interpretation of collected data. Leedy and Ormrod (2001) purported qualitative research as less arranged in description because it composes and frames new theories. Qualitative research could also be sketched as an effective tool which happens in a natural setting and lets the researcher to innovate a degree of detail from the involvement actual experiences (Creswell, 2003). The data were investigated using content analysis and with the help of the theory of Brown & Levinson on Politeness Strategies. The first step of the analysis was to prepare the script and video of President Duterte's selected speeches. Also, part of the preparation was the transcription of the informants' interview both in the in-depth interview and focus group discussion.

As the researcher, I analyzed the data with the help of the informants' shared information. Since the informants are teachers and master's/doctorate's degree holder majoring in English, they have full knowledge about Politeness Strategies of Brown & Levinson. The researcher analyzed the data with ease. In fact, most of participants had categorized the statement of the President into politeness strategies. Hence, as the researcher, I have analyzed and confirmed their answers by referring to the gathered literature about Politeness Strategies. Besides, in this study, I made sure procedures should be done securely, in as much, that the work's findings were the results of President Duterte's politeness strategies as reflected on his speeches. To reduce the effect of investigator bias, a consultation from experts specifically in linguistics side was needed. Thus, I needed to request competent Doctor of Education in Applied Linguistics professors, who were my data analysts, to review my work and add suggestions for the improvement of my study.



Apparently, the textual part of the transcription and gathered literature helped the researcher in the data analysis. Hence, content analysis was evident in analyzing the data to answer the concerns of the first and second research question of the study. Furthermore, Politeness Strategies theory of Brown & Levinson also contributes in the analysis part.

## 5. Results

### *What are the politeness strategies present in the speeches of President Duterte?*

In analyzing the politeness strategies of President Duterte, it is important to look into his verbal and nonverbal reaction as reflected on his speeches. Table 1 reveals the different politeness employed by our President as reflected on his verbal and nonverbal reaction which is significant to be further explored in this study. The President of the Philippines is undeniably known to be a man having tough and cursing words when delivering speeches. He is unstoppable when expressing his ideas, giving comments and even to the point of threatening those who disobeyed his governance. However, when delving critically to his speeches, informants both in the in-depth interview and focus group discussion have found out that the President has employed various politeness strategies apart from the politeness markers he used in his speeches.

**Table 1**

*What are the politeness strategies present in the speeches of President Duterte?*

Politeness Strategies	Supporting Statements
Bald-on Record	<p><i>Our president used the bald-on strategy through addressing the issue directly. He addressed the issue directly, he focuses on the solution of the problem. I cannot forget his statement like "Do not destroy my city. Do not destroy our young because if you do, I will kill you. There are words of command and clear warning when he is not followed. When he tries to emphasize an important point, he speaks slowly with the higher tone and toughness of his voice. He just frowned! He frowned...he has this tendency to frown. Meaning, he was serious, he was serious with his, of what he had said, noh. This can be seen when he gives warning or when he is threatening.</i></p>
Negative Politeness	<p><i>He shows high regards to policemen which is an example of negative politeness like when he said, I've been mayor of Davao City for 23 years. So my rapport with the police is a little bit closer doon sa (than) Army because the police is under the supervision of the mayor. I also noticed negative politeness used by the president through asking question, like he said 'Troop commander, could you give the order of tikas pahinga (parade rest) to the troops?'...When he delivered the lines, he used monotonous tone, then formal ang mukha (formal face). May be because it is still the opening part of the speech. I could also sense the respect of the president to the policemen when he said, "But you soldiers and policemen, remember those who kept, who have kept faith in you." with that, negative politeness has been applied. The way he delivers it might be monotonous but there is respect coupled with a formal face.</i></p>
Positive Politeness	<p><i>One of the politeness strategies present in the speeches of President Duterte, in his speech during the 39<sup>th</sup> Commencement Exercises Balagtasan Class 2018 at Silang, Cavite. It was that of Positive Politeness. He said at the start of his speech, "Thank you for your courtesy," he said that. And he wanted that all who listen to him should listen intently. His message was very convincing especially when asked about problems of drugs and killing and human rights. When he greeted the audience, like that. And the audience stood up, and he said, "Kindly sit, thank you for your courtesy." That's friendly. He smiled to the audience and use very light tone. Aside that he is friendly in greetings. He also knows what to say that is pleasing to his audience. I could remember when he said, "We will strive to have a permanent and lasting peace before my term ends. That is my goal, that is my dream. [applause]". When he uttered this line, seryoso siya both the face and the tone. (When he uttered this line, he has both serious face and tone.)</i></p>
Off-Record (indirect)	<p><i>There are times that the President is too sarcastic. Not too sarcastic but I could say sarcastic only. I figured it out when he acknowledged the Vice-President. We all know that they do not have a good relationship. So there is irony when he said this line, "Iyong una sa PMA in Baguio, then Fort Bonifacio kahapon at dito ngayon. Sana po may graduation pang iba para magkita pa rin tayo. [laughter] I love to see my Vice President (At first was in PMA Baguio, then in</i></p>

*Fort Bonifacio yesterday and today. I hope there will be more graduation so that we could see each other. [laughter] I love to see my Vice President). When he indirectly says something through exaggeration, questioning rhetorically or being sarcastic, he gets serious both in his facial expression and tone. He preferred...as well as Off-Record. Yes, more on sarcastic...He caters all of those politeness. Even the Off-Record, he is very sarcastic of his critics to be exact. He used poker face and serious tone if he tends to be sarcastic to his speech.*

---

**Bald-on Record.** The commonly used politeness he employed is the bald-on record. It is always present on his speeches. Apparently, he addressed concerned issues directly by giving orders. At times, he used warnings when he cannot contain his emotions. At some point, he could not hold himself by addressing issues with threats to the perpetrators. Giving orders is one way of the President when addressing some of the issues directly. This is evident when he would remind his constituents' responsibilities. This has been manifested by the informants in the IDI as shown below:

Bench (pseudonym) said:

*Our president used the bald-on strategy through addressing the issue directly. He addressed the issue directly, he focuses on the solution of the problem. I cannot forget his statement like "Do not destroy my city. Do not destroy our young because if you do, I will kill you." -DNIET07*

Wrangler (pseudonym) added:

*I cannot forget his line when he said, "Do not destroy my country because I will kill you. Do not rob us of the next generation because we need them for this Republic to continue. And I will kill you." That is bald-on. Addressing issues directly by giving order.-DNIET04*

Bobson (pseudonym) also emphasized:

*... "Do your duty,"... I guess that is a direct way of giving orders to his policemen under his governance and it is a bald-on strategy - DNIET06*

Petrol (pseudonym) also stressed:

*When dealing with issues, the President responds to them directly. He would also address them to the enemies in a form of giving orders which is a bald-on strategy. He would say, "Do not destroy our country. And to the foreigners, I would say to them, do not destroy the Philippines and do not destroy the youth of my land... - DNIET05*

The giving of order as shared by DNIET04 is directed to the drug dealers. Meanwhile, the giving of order expressed by DNIET06 is intended for the batch of soon to be policemen during the 39<sup>th</sup> Commencement Exercises for PNPA "Maragtas" Class of 2018. The last excerpt is for the foreign drug dealers who are destroying our youth. The informants in the FGD attested that giving orders as part of the bald-on record strategy is evident on the speeches of President Duterte when addressing the issue directly. Below are the statements of the President when giving orders as shared by the informants:

Regatta (pseudonym) uttered:

*SO, one giving order statement that he had uttered was "Perform your duty" when he was talking to PNPA graduates. He uttered, "Just perform your duty in accordance to the law, "If you need to kill, then I am going to protect you, don't be afraid to miss a life in service and duty." Obviously, it is bald-on for giving orders – DNFGT02*

Mossimo (pseudonym) spoke:

*He also said, to our police officers and other officials, do your job and you will have the*

*unwavering support of the Office of the President. [applause] I will be with you all the way. Abuse your authority, and there will be a hell to pay, [applause] for you will have become worse than criminality itself. That is a clear ordercoming from the President and an example of a bald-on – DNFGET07*

Guess (pseudonym) shared:

*He also makes order like his statement, I order the National Police Commission (NAPOLCOM) to hasten the conduct of investigation and adjudication of administrative cases against police officers involved in criminal activities and illegal activities and prescribe policies on lifestyle checks for PNP members. - DNFGET03*

The abovementioned statements are manifestations that our President used his position to address the issue directly by giving orders. Most of the orders are intended for the policemen ordering them to perform their duty. There is also an order to monitor the ill actions of the policemen which should undergo thorough investigation. These lines wherein the giving of orders is manifested are vivid examples of bald-on record. Aside from the President's directness in addressing the issue by giving orders, he used warnings and other means of threatening when he cannot contain his emotions.

Fubu (pseudonym) stated:

*Bald-on record is really evident in the speech of our President ahm, the use of threats, because the most of the time like, if you destroy my country, I will kill you! Papatayin kita! (I will kill you) that, something like that - DOIJET01*

Moreover, informant DOIJET02 in the IDI also shared the same sentiment as reflected below:

Penshoppe (pseudonym) asserted:

*he see(s) to it that he also gives warning which is considered as bald-on...something like that, "andam ko mupatay!" (I am ready to kill). - DOIJET02*

In the FGD, informants have shared that bald-on record strategy is evident through the use of warning and threatening. Below are the excerpts of their sharing:

Guess (pseudonym) remarked:

*As I observed the (3) videos, that (those) lines was (were) also viewed in other videos, there is bald-on record through warning or threatening. I just want to emphasize (na) "Do not destroy my Philippines. Another one, "I will kill you!" - DNFGET03*

Mossimo (pseudonym) iterated:

*"Not on my watch!". There is a clear warning on that statement. – DNFGET07*

Dickies (pseudonym) stated:

*...yung (That) "I will kill you!". It is threatening to those who will test his administration and that is bald-on – DNFGET05*

When the President could not hold his emotions, he usually give his warnings and threats. Meanwhile, the use of bald-on strategy is not only evident in the verbal statements of the President. The message that our dear President wants to convey gets clearer when it is coupled with his voice quality and other nonverbal reaction. For the quality of voice, the President used angry, threatening and authoritative tone; he spoke slowly with the higher tone and toughness of his voice; and he used hard tone, low-pitched and loud voice. Informants in the IDI have

shared their observation while watching the speech of the President. Below are their observations based on what they have heard and watched:

Bench (pseudonym) verbalized:

*He used hard tone and low pitched when he is giving order... Loud voice when he is mad or giving warning - DNIET07*

Bobson (pseudonym) narrated:

*There is really a word of command and clear warning when he is not followed. When he tries to emphasize an important point, he speaks slowly with the higher tone and toughness of his voice - DNIET06*

Fubu (pseudonym) voiced out:

*The tone of his voice is angry, threatening and authoritative. Actually, he really knows when to use high and low sounds... he really uttered high sounds, like "Papatayin kita!" so he knows when to use low and high sounds. He used hard tone! Because of threats - DOIET01*

The use of angry, threatening and authoritative tone, higher tone and toughness of voice, and hard tone, low-pitched and loud voice have shown the bald-on record strategy of the President to become more effective. Its usage has been also confirmed by the informants in the FGD. Below are the samples of their observation:

Dickies (pseudonym) revealed:

*Strong, most especially if he is threatening or directing DNFGET05*

Mossimo (pseudonym) added:

*If he is directing or giving orders, he is using hard tone - DNFGET07*

Jag (pseudonym) expressed:

*loud voice when he is giving warning- DNFGET01*

Regatta (pseudonym) recounted:

*...Sometimes high but his (high) pitch will be triggered because of anger. – DNFGET02*

Aside from the quality of the voice, the President has also used nonverbal gestures to send his message clearly to the audience. Apparently, the President has been expressive on his emotion by wearing a frown face, putting his hand under his chin, using a pointing hand gesture and a fist hand gesture. These nonverbal gestures have been attested by the informants in the IDI:

Bench (pseudonym) disclosed:

*the facial expression, if he doesn't like the issue or such statement, he immediately shows it by frowning, in his face, you could see that something that he is against in it. He addressed the issue directly with a frowning face- DNIET07*

Crissa (pseudonym) articulated:

*He just frowned! He frowned...he has this tendency to frown. Meaning, he was serious, he was serious with his, of what he had said, noh. This can be seen when he gives warning or when he is threatening - DNIIDS03*

Bobson (pseudonym) shared:

*non-verbal reactions, there were times that he pointed his fingers or punch his fist on speaker's stand to emphasize something when he does not like the situation- DNIET06*

Wrangler (pseudonym) asserted:

*His hands are the strong key factors when he delivers his speech. He does finger pointing... he also put his hand under his chin or on his right cheek which may imply disinterest or disgust or anger but chooses not to say any bad words to the public. – DNIET04*

The following observations have been also noted and confirmed by the informants in the FGD:

Freshgear (pseudonym) commented:

*non-verbal signs are always using his hands, pointing lalo na pag galit siya or when he is making a warning (most especially if he is angry) - DNFGT04*

Jag (pseudonym) added:

*if he is saying something as warning, pointing talaga (pointing for sure) – DNFGT01*

Regatta (pseudonym) also said:

*he would point his fingers and then touches his chin when giving warning – DNFGT02*

Bald-on record strategy, a kind of politeness strategy, in an obvious situation, has been utilized by our President. This has been evident both in his statements, quality of voice and gesticulation which make his message clearer to the audience. The use of this strategy may give an impression that our leader is a strict and an authoritative one. He says what is on his mind. He means what he says and at times he is being misinterpreted by his opponents as a dictator. However, his message has reached his audience as clear as crystal.

**Negative Politeness.** This kind of politeness is considering the hearer. This is often achieved through humility and respect towards the hearer. The President has used this strategy as observed by the informants both in the IDI and FGD. When delivering the speech, the President has expressed positively his mutual connection and support to the policemen, cabinet members, to the Moros and to the dignitaries coming from China. Furthermore, he asked questions at some point when delivering a speech. Below are the shared observations of the informants in the IDI and FGD.

Bobson (pseudonym) observed:

*I also noticed Negative Politeness in his speech because the President always emphasizes his mutual connection in participated policemen since he was the Mayor of Davao City until he became the president of the country. - DNIET06*

Petrol (pseudonym) discussed:

*He shows his high regards to the policemen which is an example of negative politeness like when he said, I've been mayor of Davao City for 23 years. So my rapport with the police is a little bit closer doon sa (than) Army because the police is under the supervision of the mayor. - DNIET05*

Wrangler (pseudonym) also said:

*He also believes the capacity of the Moro to be part of the PNPA. It can be noted from his speech when he said, Ngayon (Now), I'd like also to remind everybody that we are a one nation. That not all the Moro of Mindanao are our enemies. So maybe next time there should be a percentage*

*of the Moro people joining PMA or the PNPA. We need them. As a matter of fact, kailangan talaga natin sila. The statement of the President is too obvious that he pays respect to the Moro. Giving respect is a concrete form of negative politeness. - DNIET04*

Fubu (pseudonym) told:

*He also used negative politeness by showing his respect to the Chinese. It is obvious when he said, "Pero itong mga Intsik, pag nagsabi iyan, talagang ibibigay at maawain. Nandito 'yan sila lahat." (But the Chinese, when they promise to give, they would give and they are understanding. They are all here.) - DNIET01*

The abovementioned statements are examples of negative politeness wherein the President of the Philippines has shown humility and respect to the policemen, Muslims and Chinese. The use of negative politeness has been also attested by the informants in the FGD with these statements:

Dickies (pseudonym) declared:

*...There is negative politeness because of the respect for the way he addresses for Chinese. – DNFGT05*

Regatta (pseudonym) also shared:

*For me, I noticed that he utilized Negative Politeness...in most of his speeches since he had wanted to use the language of the commoners. – DNFGT02*

Mossimo (pseudonym) also imparted:

*I could also sense the respect of the president to the policemen when he said, "But you soldier and policemen, remember those who kept, who have kept faith in you." with that, negative politeness has been applied. – DNFGT07*

As can be noted, participants in both IDI and FGD have agreed that our President utilized negative politeness by showing respect and humility to those who deserve it. Moreover, negative politeness is also observed by the President by asking questions while delivering his speeches. This has been noted by the informants in the IDI. Below are the lines of the President which have been noticed by the informants.

Bench (pseudonym) affirmed:

*I also noticed negative politeness used by the president through asking question, like he said 'Troop commander, could you give the order of tikas pahinga (parade rest) to the troops?' - DNIET07*

Crissa (pseudonym) also believed:

*At times, nagtatanong din siya kagaya ng sinabi niya, "Itong mga human rights, ang akala nila lahat namatay doon lang sa... Then, how about my policemen?" I believe this is negative politeness because he is considering the audience and thinking the welfare of the policemen. (At times, he also asked question like what he said, "These human rights, they think all that have died where in the...Then, how about my policemen?" I believe this is negative politeness because he is considering the audience and thinking the welfare of the policemen.) - DNIIDS03*

Fubu (pseudonym) explained:

*There is also negative politeness when he tries to explain why he prefers Chinese than Americans. You can sense it with the way he asks questions like "You know, what is really wrong with an*

*American character (laughter) and an oriental gentleman?" -DOIET01*

The shared observation of the informants during the IDI which is the use of asking question is also confirmed by the informants during the FGD. Presented below are the observations of the informants in the FGD.

Mossimo (pseudonym) also said:

*Alam mo the President is using negative politeness dinadaan niya sa tanong. It simply means napaka.considerate niya kagaya nang sinabi niyang, "Hindi naman kayo sumasagot diyan, sinong --- wala kayong kasalanan? Pirmahan ko na ngayon? [Graduates reply: Yes, sir!] Wala naman itong mga kasalanan. Pirmahan ko ba ito ngayon? [Yes, sir!]." He always gives a benefit of the doubt to the policemen. (You know what, the President is using negative politeness in a question form. It means he is very considerate like what he said, "Will I sign it now? [Graduates reply: Yes, sir!] They don't commit sins. Will I sign it now? [Yes, sir!]." ) - DNFGT07*

Dickies (pseudonym) also added:

*May I add too regarding negative politeness in a question form. I noticed it the way President respected China than America with his question, "How can you be the most powerful industrial country when you owe China and you are not paying it for almost three trillion dollars?" - DNFGT05*

The use of asking question further signifies how considerate our President is towards those people whom he respected. This respect is not only shown to the policemen, Moros and Chinese but it also extended to the audience. When it comes to the delivery of the lines which belong to negative politeness, he used monotonous tone and formal face. This has been extracted from the sharing of the informants in the IDI.

Bench (pseudonym) also said:

*I also noticed negative politeness used by the president through asking question, like he said 'Troop commander, could you give the order of tikas pahinga (parade rest) to the troops?' ...When he delivered the lines, he used monotonous tone, then formal ang mukha (formal face). May be because it is still the opening part of the speech - DNIET07*

Crissa (pseudonym) also spoke:

*At times, nagtatanong din siya kagaya ng sinabi niya, " Itong mga human rights, ang akala nila lahat namatay doon lang sa... Then how about my policemen?". I believe this is negative politeness because he is considering the audience and thinking the welfare of the policemen. The tone is medyo monotone then formal ang face because of the issue. (At times, he asked question like when he asked, "These human rights, they think all that were dead where... Then how about my policemen?". I believe this is negative politeness because he is considering the audience and thinking the welfare of the policemen. The tone is lightly monotone then wearing formal face because of the issue.) - DNIIDS03*

Having a monotonous tone and wearing a formal face when asking question are also confirmed by the informants in the FGD. This has been shown in the sample statements below:

Mossimo (pseudonym) brought out:

*I could also sense the respect of the president to the policemen when he said, "But you soldier and policemen, remember those who kept, who have kept faith in you." with that, negative politeness has been applied. The way he delivers it might be monotonous but there is respect*

*coupled with a formal face. – DNFGET07*

Dickies (pseudonym) also added:

*May I add too regarding negative politeness in a question form. I noticed it the way President respected China than America with his question, “How can you be the most powerful industrial country when you owe China and you are not paying it for almost three trillion dollars?” the tone is monotonous and he has a formal face. - DNFGET05*

Negative politeness strategy is apparently used by the President. When he shows respect and humble himself, it can be reflected on his statements and even on his tone and facial expression. This simply signifies that his position as the leader of the nation never cloud his mind to give respect to those who deserve to be respected.

**Positive Politeness.** Another strategy that has been utilized by the President is the positive politeness. This politeness strategy refers to an action or utterance in which the speaker is paying attention to the positive face wants of the hearer, this is often achieved through friendliness towards the hearer. When the President delivered his speech, he punched jokes amidst serious topics, gave courtesy to the attendees of his speech, he sought agreement among the audience and he offered promises to the audience. This strategy has been noticed by the informants in the IDI. The observations are presented below:

Crissa (pseudonym) shared:

*Ahhh, sometimes, through eliciting jokes in his speeches. There were so many instances that he will just joke. I cannot forget when he joked, “Just relax, it’s 2:30, I’ll be through by four. [laughter] Kumain na kayo? Pareho tayo” (Did you eat? We are the same) - DNIIDS03*

Petrol (pseudonym) also uttered:

*Friendly. When he has the speech and then the people (are) laughing. And he says that “Makinig kayo! Huwag kayong tumawa, nandito ako sa harap niyo.” (“You listen! Do not laugh. I am here in front of you.) That’s it. I love the way he uttered those words because it’s so natural and simple but then the people were trying to be with him. To listen what he had to speak. - DNIET05*

The statements of DNIIDS03 and DNIET05 showcase the way our President punched joke during his speech. Apparently, this is a concrete example of positive politeness. It is undeniable that the President cannot have his speech without punching a joke. Another way of employing this positive politeness strategy which has been used by our President is through giving courtesy to the attendees of his speech. This has been expressed by informant DNIIDS03 in the IDI.

Crissa (pseudonym) told:

*One of the politeness strategies present in the speeches of President Duterte, in his speech during the 39<sup>th</sup> Commencement Exercises Balagtas Class 2018 at Silang, Cavite. It was that of Positive Politeness. He said at the start of his speech, “Thank you for your courtesy,” he said that. And he wanted that all who listen to him should listen intently. His message was very convincing especially when asked about problems of drugs and killing and human rights - DNIIDS03*

Penshoppe (pseudonym) also said:

*He is friendly ahhh especially in greetings. He even greeted the Vice President and said, “But if the Vice President wins, then you will have a beautiful and a young president in this country.” - DOIET02*

As reflected in the statement of DNIIDS03 and DOIET02, the President is amiable as by the way he



greeted the audience and the important dignitaries on his speeches. He even showed a friendly approach to the Vice President despite the conflict that they are into. Being friendly is a good example of positive politeness. Apart from being friendly to the audience in the form of greetings, he also sought agreement among the audience. This has been justified by the informants in the IDI as shown below:

Bench (pseudonym) imparted:

*I could also sense the positive politeness in the speech of the President when he tried to lighten an issue and is trying to convince everyone that we have the same goal. In fact, he was a bit of emotional when he delivered this line. He said, "All of us want peace, not the peace of the dead, but the peace of the living. We express our willingness and readiness to go to the negotiating table, and yet we load our guns, fix our sights, pull the trigger. It is both ironic and tragic--- and it is endless. While we extol the bravery and heroism of our soldiers — kayo the rebels -- do the same for the members and fighters. What I see instead are the widows and the orphans. And I feel their pain and grief. And no amount of cash assistance or the number of medals can compensate the loss of a human life. Sorrow cuts across - DNIET07*

Wrangler (pseudonym) also spoke:

*The President is seeking agreement to the audience when he says, "Let me make this appeal to you: "If we cannot, as yet, love one another, then in God's name, let us not hate each other too much," so it was said. [applause] I say the same to you today." With that line, there is positive politeness because he considers his audience. - DNIET04*

As reflected in the statement of DNIET07 and DNIET04, the President had made a common ground to the audience by trying to seek agreement from the audience. His line aims to convince the audience that they have the same goal and direction. He never sounds as an authoritative leader. Instead, his statement shows he has a heart as a leader. Another form of positive politeness in the speeches of the President is offering solution and making promises not only to the policemen, to the Cabinet members but also to all Filipinos. This has been attested by the informants during the IDI as follows:

Fubu (pseudonym) shared:

*Another way of showing friendliness to the audience which has been used by our President is by offering a promise. Example for this is when he said, "In this quest, I will put at stake my honor, my life, and the presidency itself. [applause]". It is positive politeness. In fact, the line is very much appealing to the audience. - DOIET01*

Penshoppe (pseudonym) expressed:

*Aside that he is friendly in greetings. He also knows what to say that is pleasing to his audience. I could remember when he said, "We will strive to have a permanent and lasting peace before my term ends. That is my goal, that is my dream. [applause]". - DOIET02*

The statement of DNIET01 and DNIET02 only shows the inclination of the President to give positive vibes to the audience. Though it is in a form of a promise, it cannot be denied that the President has the responsibility to be true to his words. It is positive politeness because the intention of the President is to give assurance to his audience not by just merely giving promises but also by setting a challenge to himself as the leader of the country. The use of positive politeness is truly evident in the speeches of the President. This is affirmed also by the informants in the FGD as reflected in the statements below:

Jag (pseudonym) stressed:

*Ahmm. I think for the friendly, when he says that "we are ready to help." It is in a form of giving*

*a promise which the audience really loves to hear from the leaders. I believe this is positive politeness. – DNFGET01*

Mossimo (pseudonym) believed:

*There is positive politeness when he cracked jokes. I cannot pinpoint the line but you really know that the President cannot have his speech without a joke. - DNFGET07*

Levi's (pseudonym) imparted:

*There is also positive politeness when he made a promise like what he promised even to the drug users. He said, "We will also prioritize the rehabilitation of drug users. We will increase the number of residential treatment and rehabilitation facilities in all regions of the country. [applause] The Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) will facilitate the preparation for the use of military camps and facilities for drug rehabilitation. [applause]. – DNFGET06*

The sharing of the informants in the FGD shows that our President has the capacity to be friendly to his audience when delivering speeches despite the fact that he is being known to have a sharp tongue and strict personality. He is a leader who also knows how to go with the level of his audience most especially the commoner. He really knows how to please his audience with his statements. The statements of the President are coupled with tone, pitch, volume and facial expression that make the statements to be classified as positive politeness. In fact, when he delivered the lines categorized as positive politeness, it was observed that the president used a combination of tone and facial expression, the light and serious facial. This has been shared by the informants of the IDI as expressed below.

Crissa (pseudonym) expressed:

*Ahhh, sometimes, eliciting jokes in his speeches. There were so many instances that he will just joke. I cannot forget when he joked, "Just relax, it's 2:30, I'll be through by four. [laughter] Kumain na kayo? Pareho tayo". (Did you eat? We are the same) When he delivered this line, he has a serious face and using a light tone. - DNIIDS03*

Fubu (pseudonym) also mentioned:

*When he greeted the audience, like that. And the audience stood up, and he said, "Kindly sit, thank you for your courtesy." That's friendly. He smiled to the audience and use very light tone. - DOIJET01*

Penshoppe (pseudonym) narrated:

*Aside that he is friendly in greetings. He also knows what to say that is pleasing to his audience. I could remember when he said, "We will strive to have a permanent and lasting peace before my term ends. That is my goal, that is my dream. [applause]". When he uttered this line, seryoso siya both the face and the tone. (When he uttered this line, he has both serious face and tone.) -DOIJET02*

The combination of serious facial and light tone, serious face and serious tones and the light facial expression and light tone had been observed by the informants in the IDI. The use of the serious facial expression and tone has never hindered the President to be still accommodating and friendly to his audience. In fact, it adds color to his speech. This observation has been affirmed by the informants in the FGD as stated below:

Mossimo (pseudonym) recounted:

*There is positive politeness when he cracked jokes. I cannot pinpoint the line but you really know*

*that the President cannot have his speech without a joke. Kahit nagjo-joke siya seryoso pa rin ang face at tone niya (Even when he is joking, he is still has a serious face and tone) – DNFGT07*

Levi's (pseudonym) also related:

*There is also positive politeness when he made a promise like what he promised even to the drug users. He said, "We will also prioritize the rehabilitation of drug users. We will increase the number of residential treatment and rehabilitation facilities in all regions of the country. [applause] The Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) will facilitate the preparation for the use of military camps and facilities for drug rehabilitation. [applause]. He used a serious face and a light tone here. - DNFGT06*

Levi's (pseudonym) also added:

*I've also noticed ahmm President Duterte has used politeness that is the Positive Politeness Strategies specifically honorifics – the calling for the title. Let's say for example the use of 'madam' and 'sir', so evident in the speeches and he is really friendly during the greetings. He smiled at them and used light tone. – DNFGT06*

The statements of the participants during the FGD are proofs that the President used combinations of serious facial and light tone, serious face and serious tone and the light facial expression and light tone when utilizing the positive politeness strategy. These combinations have been evident when he jokes around, seeks agreement, greets his constituents and when he makes or offers promises. It is also a manifestation, as attested by the informants in the IDI and FGD, that our President is not only good in thrash talk and being too direct when dealing issues but he also knows how to send positivity on his speeches.

**Off-Record (Indirect).** This kind of politeness strategy is presenting information indirectly and mostly in a declarative form, in which the speaker does a face-threatening act but does not want to be responsible for doing that face-threatening act, but instead, leaves it to the hearer to prefer in interpreting utterances. This has also been employed by our President in addressing the issue with sarcasm, using rhetorical questions, addressing the problem with exaggeration, stopping his statement if it is not appropriate for the audience, and using poker and serious face and serious tone when addressing some issue. This strategy has been noticed by the informants in the IDI. The observations are presented below:

Bench (pseudonym) recited:

*There are times that the President is too sarcastic. Not too sarcastic but I could say sarcastic only. I figured it out when he acknowledged the Vice-President. We all know that they do not have a good relationship. So there is irony when he said this line, "Iyong una sa PMA in Baguio, then Fort Bonifacio kahapon at dito ngayon. Sana po may graduation pang iba para magkita pa rin tayo. [laughter] I love to see my Vice President (At first was in PMA Baguio, then in Fort Bonifacio yesterday and today. I hope there will be more graduation so that we could see each other. [laughter] I love to see my Vice President). - DNIET07*

Petrol (pseudonym) also delivered:

*"Sorry na lang eh kasi naging president niyo ako di ba? In this statement, meron talagang sarcasm. It is up to the audience to get the meaning of his line ("Sorry for I am your President, right? In this statement, there is sarcasm. It is up to the audience to get the meaning of his line.) - DNIET05*

The abovementioned statements of DNIET07 and DNIET05 show sarcasm or irony are being utilized by

the President. Hence, off-record strategy is present wherein the President is letting his audience to decipher the intended meaning of his message. Another way of having this off-record strategy is through the use of rhetorical questions which have been confirmed by the informants during the IDI as expressed below:

Bobson (pseudonym) remarked:

*The President also uses a strategy wherein he lets the audience think by asking them hypothetical question, kagaya nalang ng sinabi niya, "Ang sinabi ko we --- it is a two-way affair. Pero I'd like to remind you that ito ba ang ibayad ninyo sa amin for fighting in your country? Ito ba yung makukuha namin?" This statement would make audience think. (The President also uses a strategy wherein he lets the audience think by asking them hypothetical question, like what he said, "As what I have said --- it is a two-way affair. But I'd like to remind you that is this what you will pay for fighting in your country? Is this what we will get? This statement would make audience thinks.) - DNIET06*

Fubu (pseudonym) said:

*I also heard the President asking question...Question na may laman kagaya na ang ng sinabi niya tungkol sa mga kaawa-awang biktima ng patayan, karahasan or kahit sa mga rape victim. He said, 'I mean, why do you have to kill somebody or molest, disturb anybody kung hindi naman ang --- may kasalanang ginawa „yan?'" (I also heard the President asking question...Question that has substance like wht he said about the victims of killing, abuse or even rape. He said, 'I mean, why do you have to kill somebody or molest, disturb anybody they are not they made brutal mistake?')- DOIET01*

This off-record strategy by means of throwing hypothetical questions could really made audience think of the issue. This is effective in a way that the audience needs to think of the situation. Apparently, the audience has been left to think of the intended message of the President. Addressing the problem with exaggeration is another off-record strategy that has been employed by the President. This has been attested by the informants during the IDI when they stated the following:

Penshoppe (pseudonym) expressed:

*Sometimes, the President utters line that makes impossible possible. If you go deeper into it thought it is exaggerated, you could believe to his statement because of conviction. Like he said, "Then I said I will finish the drugs. I will finish the drug problem before I get out. Kawawa. If I renege, it will compromise this generation and the next generation. Uubusin ko talaga „yang mga y\*\*\* na „yan. Uubusin ko, yang problema." (...It is pitiful. If I renege, it will compromise this generation and the next generation. I will end them all, all those d\*\*\*\*. I will end those problem) - DOIET02*

Petrol (pseudonym) also narrated:

*And then the last one is the Off-Record Politeness. I noticed in his speeches that he is fond of using clues and sarcasms in giving information that really builds a not threatening information or environment. He also makes use of hyperbole which is an example of hyperbole. The sample statement for this is when he said, "Maski sino. It could be --- whatever. Policeman or taga gobyerno o taga mayor's office o taga Malacañan. Ako lang... Ang sinasabi ko, hindi ako nagyayabang kasi 'yung sa galit ko, matanong ninyo 'yang mga Presidential Guard, ako lang ang presidenteng nagbubugbog talaga diyan sa...Bago kita ihulog sa Pasig River." (Whoever it is. It could be ---whatever. Policeman or in the government or in mayor's office or in Malacanang. For me...What I said, I am not bragging because of my anger, even you asked those Presidential Guards, I am the only president who will beat anyone before I throw you in the*

*Pasig River) - DNIET05*

Exaggeration is another form of off-record politeness strategy that was utilized by our President when he addressed different issues with conviction that would also convince the audience that there are possibilities to all impossibilities like he could finish all the problems as shared by DNIET02 and he could punch anyone to death as shared by DNIET05. Everyone who would hear these lines would think a thousand times to go against the President. During his speech, the president also stops his utterance if it is not appropriate to the audience. This is the other way of using off record strategy. This has been confirmed by the informants in the IDI as mentioned below.

Wangler (pseudonym) explained:

*But he does not dwell solely in it, he also reveals his off record politeness where everyone is accustomed and will be accustomed of hearing from him. With this kind of politeness, he now opens his mouth and uses the taboo, offensive, derogative and foul language of whom human rights advocates continues to criticize, and tv programs and news channels censor as always. Apart from his words were censored, there are times that he would not continue his statement. Example of this is when he said, Alam mo kasi na... P\*\*\*\*\*... 'Yung --- you know, when you are... May drugs diyan ilagay sa balsa mo and it is not really what in fact it is, huhulihin ka, pagdating sa istasyon ibubook ka. Then from there, there is no more release kasi 'yang droga is not bailable.(...You know what...M\*\*\*\*\* 'Those--- you know, when you are...There are drugs there, they will put it in your pocket and it is not really what in fact it is, they will arrest you, when you arrived in the station, they will put you in the record. Then from there, there is no more release because drugs is not bailable.) - DNIET04*

Bench (pseudonym) also expressed:

*You could also observe off-record strategy from our President kapag nag-pipigil siya. There is a part on his speech na sinabi niya ang ganito, "Yung mga racket na ganun, sinasabi ko sa lahat... Sandali ha, pigilan ko lang ang bunganga ko. [laughter]" (You could also observe off-record strategy from our President when he is controlling his emotion. There is a part on his speech when he said like, "Those sidelines like that, I will tell you all... Wait, I have to control my mouth. [laughter]" ) - DNIET07*

The statement of DNIET04 and DNIET07 shows how the President tried to control his emotion by avoiding not to utter unlikeable lines. If ever he could not control his words, the media would censor the exact thrash word he uttered. The other way of controlling his words is through stopping his statement or not saying the word at all. The use of off-record strategy which was evident on his statements is more intensified when he wore a poker and serious face coupled with a serious tone. This has been affirmed by the informants during the IDI as they mentioned that:

Bench (pseudonym) stressed:

*You could also observe off-record strategy from our President kapag nag-pipigil siya. There is a part on his speech na sinabi niya ang ganito, "Yung mga racket na ganun, sinasabi ko sa lahat... Sandali ha, pigilan ko lang ang bunganga ko. [laughter]". Here, ang serious niya both in his facial expression and his tone. (You could also observe off-record strategy from our President when he is controlling his emotion. There is a part on his speech when he said like, "Those sidelines like that, I will tell you all... Wait, I have to control my mouth. [laughter]". Here, he is serious both in his facial expression and his tone.) - DNIET07*

Bobson (pseudonym) recounted:

*The President also uses a strategy wherein he lets the audience think by asking them hypothetical question, kagaya nalang ng sinabi niya, "Ang sinabi ko we --- it is a two-way affair. Pero I'd like to remind you that ito ba ang ibayad ninyo sa amin for fighting in your country? Ito ba,, yung makukuha namin?" This statement would make audience think. In delivering this line, the President is wearing a poker face but using a serious tone. (The President also uses a strategy wherein he lets the audience think by asking them hypothetical question, like what he said, "As what I have said --- it is a two-way affair. But I'd like to remind you that is this what you will pay for fighting in your country? Is this what we will get? This statement would make audience thinks. In delivering this line, the President is wearing a poker face but using a serious tone.) - DNIET06*

Fubu (pseudonym) revealed:

*I also heard the President asking question...Question na may laman kagaya na ang ng sinabi niya tungkol sa mga kaawa-awang biktima ng patayan, karahasan or kahit sa mga rape victim. He said, 'I mean, why do you have to kill somebody or molest, disturb anybody kung hindi naman ang --- may kasalanang ginawa „yan?' dito, medyo poker face si Mr. President but using a serious tone. (I also heard the President asking question...Question that has substance like what he said about the victims of killing, abuse or even rape. He said, 'I mean, why do you have to kill somebody or molest, disturb anybody they are not --- they made brutal mistake?' Here, the President has a poker face but using a serious tone.) - DOIET01*

The sharing of the informants in the in-depth interview showcases on how our President employ the off-record strategy through is addressing the issue with sarcasm, using rhetorical questions, addressing the problem with exaggeration, stopping his statement if it is not appropriate for the audience, and using poker and serious face and serious tone when addressing some issue. This strategy has been attested by the informants in the FGD. The observations are expressed below:

Dickies (pseudonym) said:

*he preferred...as well as Off-Record. Yes, more on sarcastic...He caters all of those politeness. Even the Off-Record, he is very sarcastic of his critics to be exact. He used poker face and serious tone if he tends to be sarcastic to his speech. - DNFGT05*

Jag (pseudonym) shared:

*In the off-record strategy, he is very matalinghaga (rhetorical) most especially in asking question that would make the audience think of the President's question. - DNFGT01*

Regatta (pseudonym) also remarked:

*For me, I noticed that he utilized Negative Politeness as well as Off-Record Politeness in most of his speeches since he had wanted to language of the commoners. As part of his off-record strategy, he overstates his solution to the issue to the the point na nag-iisip ka na magagawa ba iyon ng Presidente? (to the point that you will think if the President could really do that) – DNFGT02*

Jag (pseudonym) also added:

*he has a neutral face and uses a serious tone in the off-record.- DNFGT01*

Freshgear (pseudonym) also explained:

*When he indirectly says something through exaggeration, questioning rhetorically or being*

*sarcastic, he gets serious both in his facial expression and tone. - DNFGT04*

The entire Politeness Strategies identified by Brown & Levinson (1987) were all present in the statement, facial expression and tone of the President as he addressed different issues during his speeches. Everyone knows that the President is direct and straightforward when addressing problems and issues. This leads him to have employed the bald-on record strategy. However, other politeness strategies were also utilized. These strategies are carefully identified by the informants in the IDI and FGD. When the President shows humility and respect on his speeches as reflected on his statements, tone and gesticulation, he unconsciously has used the negative politeness. When his lines, tone, and gesticulation tend to be positive and friendly, he has employed the positive politeness. When he becomes sarcastic, exaggerating and rhetorical, he has utilized the off-record strategy. This sums it all that our President has been a dynamic speaker and has a varied means of directing his intended message to his audience.

### *How does the audience interpret politeness as revealed in the intentions of President Duterte's speeches?*

In analyzing the politeness of President Duterte, it has been found out that the President has made use of varied politeness strategies, such as: bald-on record, positive politeness, negative politeness and off-record strategy. In delivering his speeches, the President had combined these politeness strategies which made his speech worthwhile to listen to. Hence, his ways of addressing different issues on his speeches have also led different interpretation from his audience. Table 2 shows the interpretation of the audience on the politeness of the President on his speeches. As shared by the informants during the IDI and FGD, it is revealed that the President gives excitement to the listener, catch the audience' participation and suggest appropriate reaction of the audience on sensitive speeches.

In terms of **giving excitement to the listener**, the audience was very excited to listen as to what could be the next words of the President. It can be even manifested on the audience's facial expression. They are truly amazed and interested with the way the President had played with his words even when presenting crucial issues. This emerging theme has been extracted from the shared observations of the informants during the IDI. Below are the excerpts from their sharing:

Bobson (pseudonym) uttered:

*Based on the video, we have seen people are very excited to listen as to what could be the next words of the President because sometimes, though the topic is serious, he injects jokes, if so, that the audience applauded and then you can see on their faces that they are really excited to listen. - DNIET06*

Bench (pseudonym) shared:

*There are also instances that you could see from the audience that they are truly amazed of the President's line. Well, you could notice that the audience are waiting for the next line of the President. - DNIET07*

**Table 2**

*How does the audience interpret politeness revealed in the intention of President Duterte's speeches?*

Emerging Themes	Supporting Statements
Give excitement to the listeners	<p><i>Based on the video, we have seen people are very excited to listen as to what could be the next words of the President because sometimes, though the topic is serious, he injects jokes, if so, that the audience applauded and then you can see on their faces that they are really excited to listen.</i></p> <p><i>There are also instances that you could see from the audience that they are truly amazed of the President's line. Well, you could notice that the audience are waiting for the next line of the President.</i></p> <p><i>yes, I agree. It seems that the audience has been hypnotized by the charisma of the President. They get excited of what he would say.</i></p>

---

Catch the audience participation	<p><i>The audience clapped their hands, clapped their hands while the President was addressing his speech in the SONA. I was watching the SONA. So they clapped hands, they smiled and they smiled sweetly but sometimes laughed in unison. They laughed in unison especially the President cracked jokes occasionally. So, we can see that in many of his speeches.</i></p> <p><i>I think the audience have mixed emotions and points of view on any speech PRD has delivered to the public and even to the media. Some were laughing on PRD's jokes and promises citing his 2016 State of the Nation Address wherein the majority clapped their hands as they hear good news and updates on benefits, resolutions and promises to Filipino citizens.</i></p> <p><i>Even if the president is relaying a serious matter, like expressing his anger or giving orders or making some warning to the enemies of the government, the President still receive an applause from the audience or they simply nod as an agreement. This simply means that the audience likes what they have heard to the President</i></p>
Suggest appropriate reaction of the audience on sensitive issues	<p><i>Apparently, some kept quiet since they were the target of PRD's bull's eye segue citing PRD's speech on the 2016 Integrated Bar of the Philippines Inauguration and 39<sup>th</sup> Commencement Speech of the Maragtas Class 2018 and wherein PRD went all out ranting those who were against his advocacies.</i></p> <p><i>I believe the audience knows how to pay respect to the President. If he says something bad about the issue, tatahimik ang audience. (the audience gets silent). If he gives order, they would listen. Mostly, the opposition, yuyuko nalang.(bow down)</i></p> <p><i>You could see that some of the attendees were silent, maybe they are contemplating with the words of the President. I guess the platform is not also a good avenue to express your negative reaction. I have observed that some of the oppositions prefer to bow down their heads while listening. At least they know the word respect</i></p>

---

Fubu (pseudonym) delivered:

*The variation of the President in his speaking style gets the audience more excited. Indeed, the audience enjoys the style of the President. He is truly different from the previous presidents. The audience is eager to know more what his next words could be. - DOIET01*

The abovementioned statements of the informants during the IDI clearly show the excitement of the audience to the statements of the President. This simply means that whether the President gets mad, punches joke, gives orders, addresses issues with warning or threats, still, the audience interprets it positively through its laughter, smile and excitement. In fact, the audience excitedly waits for the President's next statement. The same observation has been noted by the informants in the FGD. Their statements are expressed below:

Dickies (pseudonym) asserted:

*I believe the audience knows the President well. Based on their reactions, it seems that they are comfortable with the way President presents his speech. You can see it in their laughter, smile. – DNFGT05*

Levi's (pseudonym) also said:

*I guess kahit ano pa statement ng President (I guess whatever would be the statement of the President), the audience would accept it. – DNFGT06*

Jag (pseudonym) also believed:

*yes, I agree. It seems that the audience has been hypnotized by the charisma of the President. They get excited of what he would say. - DNFGT01*

The statements of the informants during the FGD is a proof that the audience does get excited with the statements of the President. Whether the President warns, threatens, gets mad or gives order, the audience shows interests and enjoys the way the President delivers his speeches. This simply means that the speaking style President never bore the audience.

**Catch the audience participation** is one of the themes that was identified based on the statements of the informants. It has been observed that the audience has expressed their admiration to the President's speeches by applauding while listening to the speeches of the President; laughing in unison when the President cracked jokes;



nodding when they agreed to the statement of the President. Apparently, the audience are moved into action with the President's words. Informants' statements as expressed below serve as bases for the theme.

Crissa (pseudonym) expressed:

*The audience, the audience clapped their hands, clapped their hands while the President was addressing his speech in the SONA. I was watching the SONA. So, they clapped hands, they smiled and they smiled sweetly but sometimes laughed in unison. They laughed in unison especially the President cracked jokes occasionally. So, we can see that in many of his speeches. – DNIIDS03*

Wrangler (pseudonym) shared:

*I think the audience have mixed emotions and points of view on any speech PRD has delivered to the public and even to the media. Some were laughing on PRD's jokes and promises citing his 2016 State of the Nation Address wherein the majority clapped their hands as they hear good news and updates on benefits, resolutions and promises to Filipino citizens. – DNIET04*

Fubu (pseudonym) disclosed:

*Even if the president is relaying a serious matter, like expressing his anger or giving orders or making some warning to the enemies of the government, the President still receive an applause from the audience or they simply nod as an agreement. This simply means that the audience likes what they have heard to the President - DOIET01*

The statements of the informants during the IDI clearly manifest the convincing power of our President. He could really move the audience to participate and be part of his speeches. There are no idle moments on the part of the audience. This manifestation has been also noted by the informants during the FGD. Their statements are expressed below:

Regatta (pseudonym) stressed:

*For me, I would say that the politeness employed by our President be it bald-on, off-record, positive politeness and negative politeness, the audience takes it positively. It can be seen from their reaction. Kahit nga nag-mumura na ang President which can be considered as impolite, tumatawa or pumapalakpak pa rin ang audience. (Even though President is cursing which can be considered as impolite, the audience still laughs or gives applause to him.) – DNFGT02*

Dickies (pseudonym) also imparted:

*You could also notice na the audience would really laugh hard especially sa mga jokes. If they like the statements lalo na yong mga inspiring words, the audience will nod as a sign of agreement. – DNFGT05*

Levi's (pseudonym) stated:

*If they like the statement, the audience would laugh and others would really clap their hands. Some would bow down their heads. It means agree sila sa statement ng Pangulo. - DNFGT06*

The statements of the informants during the FGD is a clear evidence that the President can entice the audience with his words only. Furthermore, the statements serve as concrete evidence that the President has his unique ways of addressing different matters that could make the audience participate as reflected on their reaction. Despite the length of the speech, the unique style of the President had helped the audience forget boredom. Another theme that has been extracted from the observation of the informants in the IDI and FGD is that the audience **suggest appropriate reaction on sensitive issues**. The theme has been generated through the

supporting statements that have been shared by the informants. As reflected from the words of the informants, it can be noted that the audience keep quiet since they were the target of the President's speech; the audience is attentive while listening to the President's speeches; and some of the audience bow their heads while listening. Below are the statements of the informants in the IDI as a proof:

Wrangler (pseudonym) spoke:

*Apparently, some kept quiet since they were the target of PRD's bull's eye segue citing PRD's speech on the 2016 Integrated Bar of the Philippines Inauguration and 39<sup>th</sup> Commencement Speech of the Maragtas Class 2018 and wherein PRD went all out ranting those who were against his advocacies. - DNIET04*

Bench (pseudonym) uttered:

*You could see that some of the attendees were silent, maybe they are contemplating with the words of the President. I guess the platform is not also a good avenue to express your negative reaction. I have observed that some of the oppositions prefer to bow down their heads while listening. At least they know the word respect - DNIET07*

Penshoppe (pseudonym) affirmed:

*I believe the audience knows how to pay respect to the President. If he says something bad about the issue, tatahimik ang audience. (the audience gets silent). If he gives order, they would listen. Mostly, the opposition, yuyuko nalang.(bow down) – DOIET02*

The observation of the informants in the IDI has been intensified by the informants in the FGD. The statements of the informants are clearly expressed below:

Mossimo (pseudonym) imparted:

*The President knows how to silence the audience. If the issue is a serious matter, nakikinig naman sila. If may pinatatamaan ang Presidente (If the President is trying to pinpoint someone), I have observed that they would just bow down their heads. – DNFGT07*

Regatta (pseudonym) also shared:

*...Pero, I also noticed na pag seryosong usapan na (But I also noticed that if it is a serious matter), the audience gets serious by listening to the President's speech. – DNFGT02*

Dickies (pseudonym) said:

*mga times then that the audience keeps quiet and just listen most especially if the President is telling a story or pag nakikita nila na galit na ang Presidente. (There are times that the audience keeps quiet and just listen most especially if the President is telling a story or they noticed the President is mad - DNFGT05*

Apparently, informants in both IDI and FGD had the same observation regarding how the audience interprets the politeness of the President. The audience may have varied reactions but the dominant revelation as to the interpretation of the audience is concern is that there is an excitement on the part of the audience as they listen to the President's statement, audience's attention has been caught as can be seen from their participation and the audience has suggested appropriate reaction on sensitive speeches.

## 6. Discussions

This qualitative research had employed content analysis approach in identifying the politeness strategy

utilized and uttered by President Duterte. Lestari et al (2018) expounded qualitative research as to having a goal which is to describe a certain situation. Besides, it refers to basing on the description data where it does not use any statistics process. Observation and analysis were used in getting data. Listening, reading and viewing the speeches of President Duterte were also done by the active and involved participants.

Content analysis was also employed in this study. This refers to an approach which evaluates audio-video with written materials comprehensively, then the separation of formulated assessment will be done imploring such specific criteria so that the gathered data will be provided and subject for future study utilization (Dincer, 2018). The analysis and observation were done by the involved informants using Brown & Levinson's politeness theory. Next, the data were displayed through matrix for easy understanding. Then, the concluding part was the next step wherein it was doomed as to whether essential information will answer the research questions (Lestari, et al, 2018).

This study is supported by Brown & Levinson's politeness theory. This was used in analyzing the politeness of the President on his speeches and the interpretation of the audience to the politeness of the President. Using the theory as a lens also helps the researcher to have clearer understanding about the concerned study. The results have added to the growing knowledge about politeness which focuses more on the speeches of the President of the Philippines.

Content analysis is the perfect approach in explaining about the politeness strategy which are employed by our President while delivering his speeches. This particular study looked into the politeness of the President when he delivered his five speeches. There were 14 participants in this study, seven for the in-depth interviews and another seven for the focus group discussion as they were asked to contribute and share their observation regarding the politeness of the President and the interpretation of the audience about the President politeness based on the video and the manuscript of the speeches that have been given to them. All of them are residing from different areas in Tagum City.

**Politeness Present in the Speeches of President Duterte.** Based on the results of the study, President Duterte has employed various politeness strategies on his speeches. This had made him a very dynamic speaker. On the observation of the informants during the IDI and FGD and based on the video that they viewed and the manuscript of the speeches that they read, they were able to identify the politeness employed by the President which are: *bald-on record, negative politeness, positive politeness and off-record*.

Results of this study revealed that **bald-on record** is one of the most prominent strategies that were used by the President. The informants in both IDI and FGD had observed that the President had addressed some issues directly by giving orders, expressed himself using warnings and use of threats. In terms of his voice quality, he spoke slowly with the higher tone and toughness of his voice, used hard tone, low-pitched and loud voice, and used angry, threatening and authoritative tone. When it comes to nonverbal aspect, the President wore a frowning face, used a pointing hand gesture, utilized a fist hand gesture, and put his hand under his chin. All of these aspects are categorized as part of bald-on record strategy.

Cutting (2008) believed that the most direct and threatening strategy is to perform baldly on record. Direct speeches are used, and they tend to have imperatives having no alleviating devices. Brown & Levinson (1987) noted that these actions follow Grice's Maxims of Cooperation. They are essential, concise and will elude ambiguity and do not communicate more than is required and thus no concern for face wants is expressed. Bald-on-record actions are performed if speaker has meaningfully a lot of power than the hearer or when the threat involved is minute. When instantaneity or efficacy is coercive, a face threatening action can also be done without redress (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

The target of bald on-record strategies is not minimizing the threat to the hearer's face. They are used to directly address the other person to express his/her needs. Using mitigating devices such as 'please' can soften the command (Adel et al., 2016) and is a form of bald on record. This is where the President addressing the issue

by giving orders falls. However, it is noted that the president is not using a mitigating device like please to soften his command. This is also presenting information to the hearer in which you make it obvious that your intention is to be face threatening towards that hearer (Maginnis, 2011). It is direct and is more on efficiency over satisfying the face wants of the hearer, which means that speaker presents information in a clear and detailed manner without saying anything in addition.

The very reason why speakers use the bald on-record strategy is that they want to do the FTA with highest level of efficacy more than they would want to have hearer's face satisfaction. In this study, it is revealed that the President has no intention to satisfy the hearer's wants specifically when he is giving warning or threat. The usage of bald on-record strategies diversifies in various situations depending on the speaker's goals and include scenarios wherein the face threat is not minimized and those in which the face threat is minimized by indication (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The two kinds of bald on record usage are present, namely: non-minimization of the face threat and FTA-oriented bald on record usage. In this case, the President had used the non-minimization of the face threat. If President gives orders and uses warning or threat, he used the non-minimization of the face threat by applying the maximum effectivity and authority of the speaker is higher that differs to the hearer (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

The use of the maximum efficiency is evident because the President gives order, uses warning and threats because of great urgency or desperation. In addition, the use of direct command is usually happening in an emergency situation. The President is addressing problematic issues that need immediate attention. This maximum efficiency is employed when efficiency is very more important than saving other's face. Apparently, the main aim of the President is to provide concrete solutions to the issues than impressing his audience. Aside from maximum efficiency, the President uses the power which varies where the speaker's authority is higher. This strategy is widely used if there are differences between speaker and hearer. It could be either the speaker is more powerful than hearer and does not fear counterattack or non-cooperation from hearer. Speaker would not do the redressing of expressions just to cope the hearer's face. For obvious reason, the President knows how to use his position. He is not afraid if the audience will get intimidated to his speech. It is very clear with the way he gives orders and uses warning or threat.

In analyzing the politeness of the President, the verbal and nonverbal aspects which are employed by the President were considered. Brown & Levinson (1987) went further with the notion of face-threatening acts, stating that face-threatening acts could either be verbal communication including the characteristics of speech such as tone, pitch, loudness, stress, rhythm, articulation, quality of voice and intonation or non-verbal communication like gestures, facial expressions and posture (Goffman, 1967). Since the President has been very expressive to his emotion which can be noted from his voice like having a loud voice, high pitched volume of voice, hard tone and facial expression like frowning and serious face, these make the bald-on record strategy of the President effective.

The other form of politeness that was employed by the President on his speeches is the **negative politeness**. In this strategy, the President expressed positively his mutual connection and support to the policemen, cabinet members and to the dignitaries coming from China. He asked questions at some point when delivering a speech. When it comes to the manner of delivery, he used monotonous tone with a formal face. According to Meyerhoff (2011), negative politeness is an action or utterance in which the speaker is giving attention to the negative face wants of the hearer, this is often achieved through humility and respect towards the hearer. The purpose of the negative politeness strategy is the concern for the speaker and the hearer with the desire for the freedom of action caused by the expression of restraint and avoidance (Song, 2012). Negative politeness is categorized into ten sub-strategies, namely: being conventionally indirect, questioning or hedging, being pessimistic, minimizing the imposition, giving deference, apologizing, impersonalizing the speaker and the hearer, stating the face threatening act as a general rule, nominalizing, and to go on-record as incurring a debt or as not indebteding the hearer (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

These strategies are pointed towards the hearer's negative face and these are tended to highlight the deference of the speaker to the hearer (Huang, 2007). Negative politeness tells what is fully apprehended under respectful behaviour and it is connected to the common meaning of politeness in the West. This strategy is utilized to pay attention to the feeling of someone. Most of the times, apology is observed (Yule, 1996). So, politeness highlights the listener freedom right. In this strategy, the speaker can pay respect; he can maintain social distance; avoiding the threat; minimizing the mutual face loss; and he can indicate that he has the other's face want in his mind (Kurniatin, 2017).

In this study, the theory supports the way the President pays respect to the policemen, cabinet members and to the dignitaries coming from China as he expressed positively his mutual connection and support to them. This is a vivid example of negative politeness wherein the speaker can pay respect (Kurniatin, 2017). Another example of negative politeness that has been employed by the President is the art of questioning (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The art of questioning implies that the speaker does not presume or restrain the hearer. Moreover, the use of monotonous tones and formal face of the President while delivering his statements which are considered negative politeness is supported by Goffman (1967) Brown & Levinson (1987). They went further with the notion of face-threatening acts which are part of politeness strategies where face-threatening acts could either be verbal communication including the characteristics of speech such as tone, pitch, loudness, stress, rhythm, articulation, quality of voice and intonation or non-verbal communication such as gestures, facial expressions and posture (Goffman, 1967).

The other noted politeness of the President is the **positive politeness** wherein the President punched jokes amidst serious topics, gave courtesy to the attendees of his speech, asserted common ground among the audience, offered promises to the audience, and used a combination of tone and facial expression (light, serious tone) as his way of delivery. With the use of this politeness, the President is trying to build friendliness and solidarity towards his audience. Positive politeness intends to show positive face of the audience. There must be a desirable way to have a nice feedback from the hearers (Brown & Levinson, 1987). By using positive politeness strategies, the speaker shows that they have mutual grounds between the audience and both can be called as co-operators. Compliments or jokes are the examples. These could be used freely in talks with no mitigation of a particular face threat. With the positive face of the speaker in the entire speech, the social space between them is reduced, yet the possible FTA becomes weak.

Positive politeness is an action or utterance in which the speaker is paying attention to the positive face wanted by the hearer, this is frequently achieved through friendliness towards the hearer (Meyerhoff, 2011). The purpose of the positive politeness strategy is to build connection and close relation to the speaker and the hearer which means friendly relationship between them (Song, 2012). This kind of politeness is categorized into fifteen sub-strategies; noticing the hearer, exaggeration, accentuating the interest to the hearer, use of in-group identity marker, finding agreement, avoidance of disagreement, assertion of mutual ground, joking, asserting the speaker's knowledge of and concern for the hearer's face wants, offer or promise, optimism, the participation of speaker and hearer in an activity, giving or asking for reasons, assumption or assertion of reciprocity, and giving rewards to the hearer (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

In the case of President Duterte, he uses jokes, sought agreement, and gives offerings or promises which are apparently examples of positive politeness. Brown & Levinson (1987) stated that joking makes the hearer comfortable because jokes comes from a mutual shared environment and cardinals. It is a basic positive-politeness technique for putting H 'at ease'. Joking usually happens because of nearness and belongingness. However, seeking agreement indicates the speaker saves the positive face of the hearer by finding ways to agree with the hearer such as lifting of safe topics or through repetition. It is somewhat finding the common topics or ideas where both could have an agreement and be with those topics.

For the offering or promising, this strategy implies that the speaker claims what the hearer wants and will help get it. It aims to show that the speaker has a good intention to satisfy the positive face wants of the hearer.

With regards to his combination of tone and facial expression (light, serious tone) as his way of delivery, this is supported by Goffman (1968) and Brown & Levinson (1987) wherein tone and facial expression are essential elements of the politeness strategies. The last but not the least identified politeness strategy employed by our President is the **off-record (indirect)**. This strategy has been used by the President by addressing the issue with sarcasm, using rhetorical questions, addressing the problem with exaggeration, stopping his statement if it is not appropriate for the audience, and using poker and serious face and serious tone when addressing some issue.

Off-record is presenting information indirectly and mostly in a declarative form, in which the speaker does a face-threatening act but does not want to be responsible for doing that face-threatening act, but instead, gives the decision of the hearer on how he interprets the utterances (Nisa, 2014). The purpose of the off-record strategy is for the hearer to assume the utterance of the speaker and to give a response, in which the speaker would come at as not demanding and not forceful, and the hearer as being cooperative (Safitri, 2015).

The speaker might also opt to utilize to go off-record. Through this, it is not a potential attribution that shows only one clear communicative purpose to the action (Brown & Levinson, 1987). There is a retreat protection to the hearer in denying the denotation of the words and statements (Cutting, 2008) and the speaker can save himself through not admitting the performed the face threatening performance. Off-record strategy is categorized into fifteen sub-strategies; giving hints, giving association clues, presuppose, understate, overstate, use tautologies, use contradictions, be ironic, use metaphors, use rhetorical questions, be ambiguous, be vague, over-generalize, displace the hearer, and be incomplete by using ellipsis (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In this sense, the President has used irony, rhetorical questions, overstating, and being incomplete by using ellipsis as his means of off-record strategy. By using irony, this strategy implies that the speaker utters the opposite of what they mean. Everything is up to the hearer to understand what the utterance of the speaker means. In the use of rhetorical question, the speaker asks questions without the need of an answer to the hearer. This simply means that the Speaker asks questions to the Hearer with no intention of obtaining an answer. A rhetorical question is a device used to persuade or subtly influence the audience. It is a question asked not for the answer, but for the effect. Oftentimes, it is used to emphasize a point or just to get the audience thinking.

Meanwhile, the use of overstatement implies that the speaker's utterance is exaggerated. It says something more than what is necessary. For being incomplete by using ellipsis, speaker does not complete the utterance and leaves the face threatening act half done. Ellipsis is the act of leaving out one or more words that are not necessary for a phrase to be understood. The use of poker and serious faces and serious tones when addressing some issue was applied which intensifies the off-record strategy. This is supported by Goffman (1986) that part of the politeness strategy is considering the nonverbal aspect of communication. Politeness is the word used for describing the line to which doings as well as the stated words matches hearers' thinking of how they should be acted (Grundy, 2000 as cited by Bloomer, Griffiths, & Merrison, 2005). It is also meant as displaying cognizance and contemplation for another person's face (Yule, 2006). Politeness is considered a continence on human communication, where there must be consideration of others' feelings and common comfort, and promotion of rapport is achieved (Watts, 2003). Since not everyone comes from the same city or province, his/her social norms will not all be the same since others are raised in different cultural backgrounds (Goffman, 1967). Hence, it is not impossible for the President to use varied politeness since he is dealing with people who have different cultural background.

**Interpretation of the Audience on the Politeness of President Duterte Based on his Speeches.** As revealed based on the analysis, the President has used bald-on record, negative politeness, positive politeness and off-record as his politeness strategies. With these politeness strategies, the interpretation of the audience on his politeness based on his speeches has been also considered in this study as the second research question. In this research question, three essential themes came out: *give excitement to the listeners, catch the audience participation and suggest appropriate reaction of the audience for sensitive speeches.*

The theme **give excitement to the listeners** has emerged based on the supporting statements that have been

shared by the informants. They have noted that the audience was very excited to listen as to what could be the next words of the President. Apparently, in the informants' statements, the audience gets interested and enjoys listening to the President's charismatic way of delivering his speeches. The excitement from the audience is a mere reflection of the effectiveness of the speaking style of the President. It is believed that the success of presentation will be judged not by the knowledge that the speaker sends but by what the listener receives (Nikitina, 2011).

In political oration, speaker-audience interactions always happened to both sides - the speaker and the listeners. With the speaker-listener role public speaking, audience reactions to the speaker have limitations compared to simple communications, but, individual audiences cooperate with others and respond to the speaker harmoniously with through applauding, cheering, and laughing. Even if they usually respond collectively either as a substantial group or as whole, isolated responses by one or two listeners may also be classified (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986). The audience may have their approval for a certain issue politically and displays their full support to the speaker through various civic activities (Atkinson, 1984; Bull & Wells, 2002; Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986). These sorts of activities are not the implication of speaker's fame but the audience participates because of good evaluation and performance of the speaker in general (Stewart, 2015; Bull & Feldman, 2011; Bull & Miskinis, 2015; West, 1984). These are important instant responses from the internal audience in the venue, thus, these are also essential factor on how the mass media presented the performance of the speaker (West, 1984).

The utmost attention of the listeners and the way mass media's attention toward the speaker depicts good leadership (Stewart, 2015). Moreover, the entire counterreactions of the general audience talks about speaker's wonderful charisma (Atkinson, 1984). These collective responses could also lead to the identification of groups who supported the speaker well (Bull & Feldman, 2011; Stewart, 2015). Therefore, collective responses of the listeners play a crucial role in the oratorical setting.

Another theme that has emerged is **catch the audience participation**. This has been identified as the informants observed that the audience showed admiration by applauding while listening to the speeches of the President; the audience laughed in unison when the President cracked jokes; and audience nodded when they agreed to the statement of the President. When it comes to audience response, it can be categorized into two: affiliative or positive response and disaffiliative or negative response. Affiliative, or positive responses are defined as "applause, cheers, and laughter", while disaffiliative, or negative responses are defined as "boos, jeers, and heckles" (Atkinson, 1984).

Applause is a primary focus of audience behavior in extant scholarship using the Atkinson (1984) and Bull (2003; 2016) framework due to its prevalence and its ability to signal approval of the speaker. While laughter is more of a physiological reaction to a humorous comment and booing largely depends on situational circumstances (such as mutual monitoring) for success, applause occurs naturally in the presence of both mutual monitoring and independent decision-making (Stewart, 2015). The prevalence of applause over other forms of audience responses has led to most of the theory regarding rhetoric and audience response to be based upon applause behavior. Meanwhile, laughter is a complex psychological and physiological response to any humorous statements and jokes made in everyday conversations, advertisements, media broadcasts, and even political speeches (Meyer, 2000). Humor in politics may be used by speakers to lighten the harshness of an attack and engender mirth in the audience. Mirth, "the particular emotion showcased through perceiving humor" explains the emotional experience that occurs within individuals in audiences when they are exposed to humor and jokes that provides positive emotions (Martin, 2007). The physiological nature of laughter makes isolated and asynchronous instances rare, especially in group settings, due to the contagiousness of the act of laughing itself in which it is not uncommon to laugh simply because you hear someone else laughing (Provine, 2000).

**Suggest appropriate reaction of the audience for sensitive speeches** is another theme that has been determined based on the informants' observation. This has been evident when the audience keep quiet since they

are the target of the President's speech, the audience is attentive while listening to the President's speeches, and some of the audience bow their heads while listening. Possibly, some of them have been the target of the President's statements or some might have some questions, but they prefer to keep silent or bow down their head as respect to the position.

The action of the audience can be interpreted as suggesting or displaying appropriate reaction to the President's speeches by being silent wherein some bowed down their head and by listening attentively. Silence has an abundant, incomplete and even paradoxical nature. The political view of silence could not be reduced to any specific political functions. Aside from its accepted antithesis and language, silence counteracts amnesty. Communication is based on our capability to give our thoughts and emotions and this becomes one of the fundamental human interaction. Language is the earliest avenue of conversing, while silence is giving lots of data to the extent of things that are hardly expressed with verbatim way. As an example, in the culture of China, silence has positive impact to them. Chinese stresses out the good thing of silence gives in their communication because it could mean agreeing to certain statement or even disagreeing some topics, praising the speaker, protesting issues, way of deciding and respecting others in authority (Samovar 1998).

In the social relationship setting, silence could mean the point of solidarity or order in a hierarchic way of relationship between communicators. Family culture of Chinese as for example, the elders has the right to talk more than the younger generation. No interruption would happen to them if an elder talk. The younger family member would only listen attentively. There is connotation in a conversation wherein the silent one means to be in subordination, In the society which follows hierarchy, more time and more opportunities to talk for those who have higher ranks. The subordinates are ejected in telling their views and opinions and most of the time, they tend remain in silence (Yuan, 2015).

In the affective point of view, silence may be an indication of lack of interest, injured feelings, or contempt. Silence could be an expression of agreement, disagreement, praise, or respect. Silence encompasses humongous definitions. In practical way, silence could be the way to maintain communicators' face. (Brown & Levinson 1987) postulated the consideration of positive face and negative face as two sides of a continuum. Speech and silence might be in the two distinctive features wherein speech might be the way to remain the positive face, while silence might be the tactic to maintain negative face (Yuan, 2015).

Aside from keeping silent as a way of suggesting appropriate reaction, some audience bowed their heads while listening. There could be other ways of communication without using words. In Asia, bowing the head has various significance like greetings, a sign of respect and expression of obedience, authenticity, humility and compassion. Bowing head or head down may mean a symbolism of rejection of other's thoughts, nevertheless the head is bowed down for reading supporting details. Head down when responding to commentaries is a symbol of failure, weakness that finds shelter (hence seeking protection), or feeling of shame (BusinessBalls, 2019).

### *6.1 Implication for Further Research*

In a smuch as this study focuses on the politeness employed by the President and the interpretation of the audience to the President's politeness, the following future researches are recommended:

First, future researches in line with this study may consider other platform of studying the politeness of the President such as: the way he deals press conferences wherein his audience has a chance to ask him questions.

Second, another form of triangulation could be brought into play for this academic study: interview accounts on audience who are not in attendance to his speeches or those who have heard the President's speeches through television or social media. This audience may add valuable insights about the President's politeness strategy.

Third, the insights of the pro-Duterte and anti-Duterte could also be a good extension and additional sources



of describing the politeness of the President. They may also conduct comparative studies between the interpretation made by pro-Duterte and anti-Duterte audience of his speeches.

Fourth, an in-depth study focusing impoliteness of the President and the interpretation of the audience.

Fifth, an in-depth study incorporating analysis of the rhetoric and persuasive strategies of the President which are appealing to the audience. Finally, future researchers specializing on pragmatics may level up this study by classifying and comparing the politeness in the speeches of the presidents of this country.

The findings of this study were collated from the insights of my fellow English teachers and research colleagues. Further research may be conducted to describe the other public speaking strategies of the President and the interpretation of the audience to these strategies.

## 6.2 *Concluding Remarks*

This qualitative study is very timely since it scrutinized the politeness of our current President who is known to have a remarkable way of delivering speeches. I was prompted to explore the politeness of the President because I have also some doubts whether there is still politeness on the President's speeches. Furthermore, I am very much comfortable to the way he speaks. Everyone who resides in Mindanao has been used to the foul words of the President. However, other Filipinos have such a hard time in accepting his way of speaking even in formal event because he is the leader and head of this country. Everyone expects him to be a noble one, a model and a prim and proper leader. Unfortunately, their expectation is too far from the reality.

Examining five different speeches using content analysis was a challenging, exhausting and meaningful undertaking. On the positive note, this journey has been lightened through the help of the informants in the IDI and FGD. Their contribution had paved the way for the completion of this endeavor. Because of this, I learned four things. First, people in the highest position are expected to be at their best in their words and in their action. However, there are some old habits which are quite hard to break. Second, language is a powerful tool to make or break a person. It can be also used to define you as a person. Third, a person can be polite at times despite the fact that he is known to be impolite to his words. Lastly, you will be interpreted or judged by anyone based on the politeness you employed.

This qualitative study has dealt with what language can do and its pragmatic sense. With all the observation of the informants in the IDI and FGD, this would enlighten everyone that our President has some sense of politeness on his speeches and the audience has somewhat accepted his way of speaking and has manifested respect to his position even though he has said some impoliteness on his speeches. With all the insights of the informants in this academic pursuit, my hopes are high that this paper can be read by many, bringing clear understanding to anyone who could be at any time become audience to our President's speeches and to the following entities: For the Filipino audience, they will be enlightened that our President has also employed politeness on his speeches despite his foul words at times.

It is of my earnest hope that this study will serve as an avenue for our audience to analyze the statements of the President. To my fellow English teachers, there is need for them to share their knowledge about politeness strategies so that their students who are also considered as the audience of our President will widen their knowledge that politeness is not limited only to politeness markers. Our responsibility as teachers has great impact and influence to the hearts and minds of our students. Let us share this knowledge in bringing a society of greater understanding, lesser judgment and more chances for better changes.

Nevertheless, this academic paper allows everyone to understand the uniqueness of our President's language. This study enables us to enlighten our judgment, discrimination and prejudice to his speeches. From the findings of the study, I, with optimism could say having this thesis title, collecting the needed contents, and conducting the interview sessions were never a piece of cake. There may be future researchers who will be interested in this

study, but the experiences I had with my research participants are refreshing and worth pondering. Every meeting with my participants has been a mix of challenge and excitement. Nevertheless, it widens my horizon.

The contribution of this study circles around the reality that language both verbal and non-verbal can be used in any area of our life. As long as we know how to take advantage of it, communication will never fail. When we judge the President's statement, we should never focus on the ill words most especially when he deals with problematic issues. No matter how hard a person is, there would always be a soft spot on him. We may have different judgments about how we perceive things but then again, a sense of responsibility and social awareness are keys to help us not to be judgmental. I hope that this academic endeavor will serve as an eye-opener to every Filipino citizen.

## 7. References

- Adel, S. M. R., Davoudi, M., & Ramezanzadeh, A. (2016). *A qualitative study of politeness strategies used by Iranian EFL learners in a class blog*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1127416.pdf>
- Al-Duleimi, H., Rashid, S. M., & Ain, N. A. (2016). A critical review of prominent theories of politeness. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(6), 262-270. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2188085834?accountid=31259>
- Ali, W., Ismail, H., & Cheat, T. (2011). Plagiarism: to what extent it is understood? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 59 (2012) 604 – 611. 2011 Published by Elsevier Ltd. Selection (2012).
- Aljazeera (2016). *Rodrigo Duterte vows to abstain from cursing others*. Retrieved from <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/10/rodrigo-duterte-vows-abstain-cursing-161028170733944.html>
- Amerson, R.M., & Strang, C.W. (2015). Addressing the challenges of conducting research in developing countries. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 47(6), 584-591. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jnu.1217>
- Amper, G.Y. (2018). *Team identity and politeness: an analysis of the University of the Philippines Diliman student council election standard bearers' speech in Philippine collegian interviews*. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/38190949>
- Anney, V. N. (2014). Ensuring the quality of the findings of qualitative research: Looking at trustworthiness criteria. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org>
- Ariola, M., & Buendia, J. (2013). *Principles and Methods of Research* (1st Ed.) Philippines: Rex Printing Company Inc.
- Atkinson, J. M. (1984). *Our masters' voices: The language and body language of politics*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Atkinson, J. M. (1984). *Public speaking and audience response: Some techniques for inviting applause*. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structure of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 370-409). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Billiones, T. (2016). Duterte reminded against use of 'gutter language'. Abs-cbn News. Retrieved from <https://news.abs-cbn.com/news/08/16/16/duterte-reminded-against-use-of-gutter-language>
- Bloomer, A., Griffiths, P. & Merrison, A.J. (2005). *Introducing Language in use: A coursebook*, London: Routledge.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978), "Politeness: some universals in language usage", in Goody, E. (Ed.), *Questions and Politeness*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987), *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bull, P. (2003). *The microanalysis of political communication: Claptrap and ambiguity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bull, P. (2006). Invited and uninvited applause in political speeches. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 563-578.
- Bull, P. (2016). Claps and claptrap: The analysis of speaker-audience interaction in political speeches. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 4, 473-492.

- Bull, P., & Feldman, O. (2011). Invitations to affiliative audience responses in Japanese political speeches. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 30, 158-176.
- Bull, P., & Miskinis, K. (2015). Whipping it up! An analysis of audience responses to political rhetoric in speeches from the 2012 American presidential elections. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 34, 521-538.
- Business Balls (2015). *Reading body language signs and communications*. Retrieved last April 4, 2020 from <https://www.businessballs.com/self-awareness/body-language/>
- Cho, I., Diaz, I., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2017). Blindsided by linearity? Curvilinear effect of leader behaviors. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(2), 146-163. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1880037612?accountid=31259>
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). SAGE Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among the Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. (pp. 77-83)
- Cutting, J. (2008). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Darmawati, Tolla, A., & Maman, M. (2017). The study of parents' words, behavior and attitude as the means to build the children's character in bulukumba regency. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(4), 750-755. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0804.14>
- Dinçer, S. (2018). Content analysis in for educational science research: Meta-analysis, meta-synthesis, and descriptive content analysis. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 176-190. <https://doi.org/10.14686/buefad.363159>
- Fitzpatrick, E. F. M., Martiniuk, A. L. C., D'Antoine, H., June, O., Carter, M., and Elliott, E. J. (2016). Seeking consent for research with indigenous communities: A systematic review. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-016-0139-8>
- Flood, A. (2010). *Understanding Phenomenology*. Retrieved from [www.journals.rcni.com](http://www.journals.rcni.com)
- Friginal, E., & Hardy, J. A. (2014). *Corpus-based sociolinguistics: A guide for students*. New York: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. NY: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *On facework: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction*. In Jaworski, A., and Coupland, N. (Eds.) *The Discourse Reader* (pp. 306-321). London: Routledge.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing pragmatics* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.
- Guba, E. G. (1990). *The alternative paradigm dialog*. In Guba EG (Ed) *The Paradigm Dialog*. Sage Publications, Newbury Park CA, 17- 30.
- Halim, H., Kaseng, S., Taha, Z., & Hamsa, A. (2015). Politeness in buginese language as a social status symbol in wajo regency. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(1), 230-239. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1661112926?accountid=31259>
- Heritage, J., & Greatbatch, D. (1986). Generating applause: A study of rhetoric and response at party political conferences. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92, 110-157.
- Houghton, C., Casey, D., Shaw, D., & Murphy, K. (2013). Rigour in qualitative case-study research. *Nurse researcher*, 20(4), 12-17.
- Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jackson, A., & Mazzei, L. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data among multiple perspectives*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Kahya, M., & Sahin, F. (2018). *The effect of leader personality on follower behaviour*. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 39(1), 14-33. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2010919936?accountid=31259>
- Kalu, F. A. & Bwalya, J. (2017). What Makes Qualitative Research Good Research? An Exploratory Analysis of Critical Elements. Retrieved from <http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/ijssr/article/view/10711>
- Kim, S. H. (2011). *An analysis of written discourse of north Korean second language speakers of English: Its*

- linguistic features and their discursive functions with pragmatic implications* (Order No. 3500072). Available from ProQuest Central. (927606088).
- Kissine, M. (2011). *Misleading appearances: Searle on assertion and meaning*. *Erkenntnis*, 74(1), 115-129. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10670-010-9229-z>
- Kousar, S. (2015). Politeness orientation in social hierarchies in urdu. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 3(2), 85-96.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* / Klaus Krippendorff. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980. Print. Sage Commtext Ser. ; 5.
- Kurniatin, K. (2017). *An Analysis of politeness strategies used by teacher and students in English Class at MTs NU Assalam Kudus*. Retrieved from <http://eprints.iain-surakarta.ac.id/666/1/33.%20Kurniyati.pdf>
- Leedy, P., & Ormrod, J. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and design* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Lestari I., et al (2018). *Politeness strategy preference of male and female teachers in classroom interaction during english classes*. Les Ulis: EDP Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20184200066>
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Sage Publications, Newbury Park CA.
- Livingstone, S. M. (1989). Audience reception and the analysis of program meaning comments on kepplinger. *The American Behavioral Scientist* (1986-1994), 33(2), 187.
- Maginnis, J. A. (2011). *Texting in the presence of others: The use of politeness strategies in conversation* (Order No. 3492187). Available from ProQuest Central. (917472500).
- Mara, H. K. (2015). *Politeness theory and the classification of speech acts*. Victoria: University of Victoria, Department of Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1886790138?accountid=31259>
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2016). *Designing Qualitative Research Sixth Edition*. SAGE.
- Martin, R. A. (2007). *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Maxwell, J.A. (2013). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. (pp. 135-136)
- Meyer, J. C. (2000). Humor as a double-edged sword: Four functions of humor in communication. *Communication Theory*, 10, 310-331.
- Meyerhoff, M. (2011). *Introducing sociolinguistics* (2nd ed). Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Mitchell, A. (2015). *Linguistic avoidance and social relations in datooga* (Order No. 3725963). Available from ProQuest Central. (1723258963).
- Min, W. (2016). *Implicit notions of identity: the absence of explicit communication in korean hybrid greetings* 1/Nociones implícitas de identidad: La ausencia de comunicación explícita en los saludos híbridos de los coreanos. *Universum*, 31(2), 119-140.
- Morand, D. A. (2014). Using politeness to model the psychosocial dynamics of power in organizational interaction. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 22(2), 247-273.
- Morse, J. & Coulehan, J. (2014). *Maintaining Confidentiality in Qualitative Publications*. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1049732314563489>
- Nikitina, A. (2011). *Successful public speaking*. Retrieved from [https://www.isbtweb.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/successful-public-speaking.pdf](https://www.isbtweb.org/fileadmin/user_upload/successful-public-speaking.pdf)
- Nisa, C. (2014). *An analysis of politeness strategies used by the main characters toward their addressees in "Snow White and the Huntsman"*. Thesis, English Department, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Advisor: Murni Fidiyanti, M.A. Retrieved from <http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/169/2/Abstrak.pdf>
- Patel, C., & Kopparapu, S.K. (2015). *A Multi-criteria Text Selection Approach for Building a Speech Corpus*. TSD.
- Peng, L., Cai, L., & Tan, X. (2012). Research on college teachers' politeness strategies in EFL classrooms\*. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(5), 981-991.
- Provine, R. R. (2000). *Laughter: A scientific investigation*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Ranada, P. (2018, July 5). *Duterte's SONA 2018 will be 'straight from the heart'*. <https://www.rappler.com/nation/206554-duterte-sona-2018-philippines-straight-from-heart>

- 
- Resnik, D. B. (2014). Data fabrication and falsification and empiricist philosophy of science. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 20(2), 423-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-013-9466-z>
- Revelling in death. (2018). *Sunday Times* Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2052509335?accountid=31259>
- Rolling Stone (December 10, 2012). *A Brief History of Presidential Profanity*. <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-lists/a-brief-history-of-presidential-profanity-149957/abraham-lincoln-92734/>
- Safitri, D. (2015). *The positive politeness strategies used by jimmy kimmel live talk show with selenia gomez as guest star*. Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis. Indonesia: UIN SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA.
- Sagaravasi, V. (2012). *Intercultural communication strategies: Discursive strategies between Americans and Thais in an English language asynchronous argumentative online forum and their impact for language education* (Order No. 3509943). Available from ProQuest Central. (1021368854). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1021368854?accountid=31259>
- Said, N. E. (2011). *Politeness strategies in requests: The Case of Elfhoul Speech Community*. Retrieved from <http://dspace.univ-tlemcen.dz/bitstream/112/3637/1/elhadj-said-nabila.pdf>
- Samovar, L.A. (1998). *Communication between cultures*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Santosa, M. (2018). *The implications of politeness strategies among teachers and students in the classroom*.
- Sharififar, M., & Rahimi, E. (2015). Critical discourse analysis of political speeches: A case study of obama's and rouhani's speeches at UN. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(2), 343-349.
- Shing, S. R. (2012). Politeness in mentor-mentee talk. *International Journal of Human Sciences*. Retrieved from <file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/2232-6834-2-PB.pdf>
- Silverman, D., & Green, T. (2010). *Doing qualitative research: a practical handbook* SAGE Publication Ltd., 6 Bonhill Street, London, EC2A 4PU
- Skukauskaitė, A. (2012). Transparency in transcribing: Making visible theoretical bases impacting knowledge construction from open-ended interview records. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 13(1) Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1012105128?accountid=31259>
- Slavova, E. (2012). *Politeness across cultures, with a specific focus on English and Bulgarian*. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118783665.ieicc0259>
- Solum, L. B. (2018). Triangulating public meaning: Corpus linguistics, immersion, and the constitutional record \*. *Brigham Young University Law Review*, 2017(6), 1621-1682. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2061491883?accountid=31259>
- Song, S. (2012). *Politeness and culture in second language acquisition*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stewart, P. A. (2015). Polls and elections: Do the presidential primary debates matter? Measuring candidate speaking time and audience response during the 2012 primaries. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 45, 361-381.
- Teng, Y. (2015). *An analysis of pragmatic functions of hedging in American presidential inaugural addresses*. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(8), 1688-1694. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0508.20>
- Voinov, V. (2013). *Politeness devices in the tuvan language* (Order No. 3568932). Available from ProQuest Central. (1426247419). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1426247419?accountid=31259>
- Wapee, K. & Damnet, A. (2018). The implementation of ISSECI model for enhancing thai EFL students' intercultural pragmatic competence: Politeness strategies. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(3), 34-42. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.9n.3p.34>
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, D. M. (1984). Cheers and jeers: Candidate presentations and audience reactions in the 1980 presidential campaign. *American Politics Research*, 12, 23-50.
- Wu, Y. (2014). *Strategies of L1 and L2 greeting and small talk in chinese* (Order No. 3636690). Available from ProQuest Central. (1615091995). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1615091995?accountid=31259>
-

- Yamaguchi, M. (2016, Oct 25). Will he chew gum? japan wary of philippine leader's visit. *AP English Language News (Includes AP 50 State Report)* Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1832051353?accountid=31259>
- Yasmeen, R., Jabeen, M. & Akram, A. (2014). Politeness and the language of Pakistani politicians. *Academic Research International Vol. 5(3)*.
- Yin, R. K. (2015). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York, CA: Guilford Publications.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Oxford introduction to language study elt: Pragmatics (pp 59-70)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2006). *The study of language (3rd ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.