

Observance of Cialdini's Principles of Speech Act of Persuasion in 2016 us Presidential Debates

Yenika Arisetiyani ^{1✉}, Issy Yuliasry ²

¹ SMP Islam Ta'allumul Huda Bumiayu

² Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:

Received 10 August 2017

Accepted 02 October 2017

Published 01 December 2017

Keywords:

observance, Cialdini's principles, speech act of persuasion, presidential debates

Abstract

Persuasion is an important factor to politicians to show the power and influence the people. In the United States Presidential Election, debate is one of the tools to convey the candidates' message. Most of the utterances used in debates aimed at affecting and convincing the audiences or the voters. Persuasion according to Searle (1979) is regarded as a directive speech act in which the speaker's intention is to make the hearers to commit him or herself to perform some form of action. Most of the researchers conducted persuasive speech acts from the point of view of discourse. There is no study about natural data like debates. This study is a study about observance of Cialdini's principles of speech acts of persuasion in 2016 US presidential debates. Therefore, there are six principles that must be observed, namely consistency, authority, reciprocity, social-evidence, preference/ liking and rareness/ scarcity. It used descriptive qualitative method to get the findings. The findings of the study are proved that most of the presidential candidates observed Cialdini's principles. They used several ways like asking the voter's need, making a promise, and disfiguring the interlocutors. Finally, this thesis provides suggestion regarding to the findings. At this point, the first plan is to present some tested principles of persuasion in debate classes. Next point is how you might use the principles to increase community interest in your topic, and to win people over, fairly and ethically, to the way of thinking.

© 2017 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉ Correspondence Address:

Jl.Hj.Siti Aminah No.10 Dukuhturi Bumiayu

E-mail: kiasatinayenika@gmail.com

p-ISSN 2087-0108

e-ISSN 2502-4566

INTRODUCTION

The presidential election in the United States is a highly followed event. The whole world is watching with excitement who becomes the new president of the super power that America undoubtedly is. The most influential tool of this event is language. Via language presidential candidates communicate with their future voters. Via language they express their ideologies, their opinions. Via language they get closer to the audience. Their ability to express themselves is widely exercised in presidential debates.

To understand language, pragmatics needs to be applied. Leech (Leech 1983) says that pragmatics can be defined as a study that deals with the use of language in a conversation. When people communicate, they perform utterances. The utterance is formed by the combination of words. The speaker convey message when they are talking to the hearer. Every human speech has different meaning and intention. This phenomenon is known as speech act.

Actions performed via utterances are generally called speech acts (Yule, 1996: 47). The speaker expects that his or her communicative intention will be recognized by the hearer. Communication is the process of exchanging the information, ideas, thought, feelings, and emotion through conversation, speech, debate, signals and behavior.

People use language to do an extraordinarily wide range of activities. It is used to convey information, request information, give orders, make requests, make threat, give warning, make bets, give advice, etc. All of the activities are done by the addressers to reach an understanding with their addressees through the use of different strategies. These include persuasion.

According to Diamond and Cobb (1999), persuasion is an act of conversion, convincing others, changing their views, shifting their ideal points along the imagined line. It can be conclude that persuasion has the power in influencing people or making them embrace

certain beliefs in order that they may either adopt new goals or abandon previous ones of higher value goals, as presented by the persuader.

There is always an attempt to attract people to one side or another. Thus, attempt to persuade people to change their opinions become a legitimate feature of political discourse. According to Fairclough (2012) Political discourse is as attached to political actors- individuals (politicians, citizens), political institutions and organizations that engaged in a set of process and though rituals events with citizens who may participate in the process of government. Therefore, language could be regarded as the vehicle of politics. In other words, the most activities performed by the politicians are done through language, such as speech, debate, inauguration, campaign, etc.

Referring to the description above, Persuasion according to Searle (1979), is regarded as a directive speech act in which the speaker's intention is to make the hearers to commit him or herself to perform some form of action; in other words, persuasion is an attempt of speaker to match the world with his/ her words (Bu, 2010, cited in Pisdigham & Rasouli, 2011).

Another study, Pishghadam and Rasouli (2011b) investigated the similarities and discrepancies between English and Persian native speakers in the employment of persuasive strategies. The aim of the study is to discover whether there is any significant difference between participants in the selection of persuasion strategies with respect to gender. The university students were the participants of this study. It uses a discourse completion test (DCT) to get the data collection. The questionnaire consists of 6 items in different contexts close to real life persuasive situations. To analyze the data, he was used Chi-square test. The participants' responses were analyzed, and the influences of gender and culture on the speech act of persuasion were discussed. From the result, it can be concluded that there are some differences and similarities between Persian and English native speakers in the employment of

this speech act which provided some pedagogical solution to pragmatic difficulties of English language learners in classrooms and their miscommunications in general.

This study only investigated the directness level of the speech act of persuading and did not consider internal modification and external modification parts of the Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP).

There were several previous studies. Jarraya (2013) investigated about Persuasion in political discourse: Tunisian President Ben Ali's Last Speech as a Case Study. The aim of this study was to check the illocutionary force of the sentences, investigate the persuasive dimension of the use deictic pronouns. The result of this study showed that the use of multiple speech acts found in the same utterance either with or without an explicit performative verb.

Some speech acts may be used as a medium to carry others. It also showed how the strategic use of deictic pronouns and agency with certain illocutionary forces helps construct otherness as well as the self. This process is enforced by the marked use of ethos, which is a crucial strategy of persuasion in political discourse. The research above is different, it uses persuasion from the view of political discourse but in my study I will use speech act of persuasion from pragmatics view.

Meanwhile Altikriti (2016) observed persuasive speech acts of Barack Obama speech. This study examined three different speeches of Obama. The analyses were based on the adopted model of Bach and Harnish Taxonomy (1979). This study has shown that Obama has directly and indirectly inclined the audience by using various speech acts dominated by the constative and assertive speech acts.

Ghasani and Sofwan (2017) analyzed appraisal and speech structure of contestants' speeches in speech contest of ESA WEEK competition. She focused on discourse analysis in analyzing the data. She integrated the theories of appraisal (Martin and White, 2005) and speech structure (Sellnow, 2005). The findings map out the high use of appreciation of attitude, entertain of engagement, and focus of

graduation applied. Those appraisal, moreover, were highly found in the body of the speech. The difference was this study used discourse studies view than the research focused on pragmatic study.

Rohmahwati and Yuliasri (2017) observed the violation of politeness maxims in the television series. They used big bang theory in analyzing politeness maxim produced by the speakers. The study used descriptive qualitative method by using observation and documentation method. This research found all maxims are violated by the character in the conversation. The difference between this study and the research lied in the aim of the research. This study looked for the violation of politeness maxim but the research looked for observance of cialdini's principle in the presidential debate.

Mujiyanto (2016) observed the verbal politeness of interpersonal utterances resulted from back-translating Indonesian texts into English. Here he explored the politeness degrees of interpersonal utterances in the source language; there was also a positive correlation between the English utterances and their back-translations. This study was from translation view whereas this research was from pragmatics view. The data was also different too.

Related to the utterances used by the candidates, it can be stated that the most of the utterances used in debates aimed at affecting and convincing the audiences or the voters. According to Simons (2003), the notion of persuasion is to make manipulative acts, but it also leaves receivers with the perception of choice. It is like the candidates try to attract votes, or a student seeks permission to take a make-up exam.

In other context it may be concluded to 'persuasion' as an effect of producing messages, whether intended or not. In line with this concept, there are six principles of persuasion that should be completed by the persuader or candidates to convince the voters (Cialdini, 2009). The six principles are consistency, authority, reciprocity, social-evidence, preference/ liking and rareness/ scarcity.

Based on the phenomenon above, the researcher interested to conduct a research by using the six principles to see whether the candidates observe the principles or not in 2016 US presidential debates.

In Speech act theory was an important breakthrough in the field of language and philosophy. It came out as a result of the work of famous philosopher J.L Austin who delivered a series of lectures on this topic 1955 that appeared in the shape of a book named 'How to do things with words' in 1962. He defined speech act as an utterance made by a speaker in a particular context.

Similarly, Yule (1996:47) defines speech acts as "actions performed via utterances." When speaker utters something, he or she then expects that the hearer will be affected by his or her utterances. According to Austin (1962 cited in Cutting (2002:16) states that, the action performed when an utterance is produced can be analyzed on three different levels. Those are locutionary acts, illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts.

Locutionary act is semantic or literal meaning of sentence. Austin said that the interpretation of locutionary act is concerned with meaning. Briefly, locutionary act is the act of producing a meaningful linguistic expression. Yule (1996:48) writes that "the illocutionary act is performed via the communicative face of an utterance" and it is an intended meaning of a speaker. Moreover, Yule (1996:49) states sometimes it is not easy to determine what kind of illocutionary act the speaker performs. The third of Austin's categories of acts is Perlocutionary Act, which is a consequence or by-product of speaking, whether intended or not. As the name is designed to suggest, perlocutions are acts performed by speaking. According to Austin, perlocutionary acts consist in the production of effects upon the thoughts or feelings. It would include such effects as; persuading, embarrassing, intimidating, boring, irritating, and inspiring the hearer.

Searle (1979, pp. 12-19) presented an alternative taxonomy of speech acts. They are

representative, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative.

Representative speech acts commit the speaker to something being the case or to the truth of an expressed proposition. The direction of fit of representatives is words to the world and the expressed psychological state is a belief. Moreover, directive speech acts are attempts by the speaker to get the hearer do something. The direction of fit is world to the words and the sincerity condition is want or desire.

Commissive operates a change in the world by means of creating an obligation; in this case, the speaker creates the obligation. These acts commit the speaker to some future course of action. Direction of fit is world to the words and the sincerity condition is intention. Expressive speech acts express a psychological state about a state of affairs expressed in the propositional content. Direction of fit is not required. The last is declarative speech acts. These acts bring about alternation in the status or condition of the referred object by virtue of the fact that the declaration has successfully been performed. Successful performance guarantees that the propositional content corresponds to the world.

Perloff R.M (2003:8) defines persuasion as a symbolic process in which communicators try to convince other people to change their attitudes or behavior regarding an issue through the transmission of a message, in an atmosphere of free choice.

According to Keraf (2004:118) stated that persuasive is a verbal art that purposely convince someone to obey what the speaker's said in this moment or in the present time. It means that the purpose of persuasion is the speaker tries to persuade the listener to act something with no violence and coercion. A persuader should make their object believe that they are trusted agent. So, from that belief people will decide a right decision by their consciousness.

Therefore, Searle (1979) regarded persuasion as a directive speech act in which the speaker intends to commit him or herself to perform some form of action. Referring to the descriptions above, the forms of persuasive utterances can be identified with the theory of

speech acts argued by Searle (1979), namely assertive, commissives, expressives, declarations, and directives. As the utterances of persuasion in campaign activities had the function of demand, request and convincing the audiences or the voters to elect the candidates, all of the utterance forms can be categorized into directives.

In delivering the principles of persuasive, Aristotle in Keraf (1989:121) stated that there are three principles of persuasion. The basic concepts are explained below. Speaker's Character and Credibility; Controlling the Audience's Emotional; and Evident

In the speaker's character and credibility, communication will take place a speaker expectation, if the audience has recognized him or her as the one who has a good character. This is usually called with personal character. Here, a good character can be determined through attitude, diction, and language style of the figure in presidential debate. The political party takes their own candidate through their quality.

The second skill is a skill of speakers in controlling the audience's emotional. It means that the speaker has performance in debasing or extinguishes the audience's sentiment and emotion. The emotion may not be inspired extremely, so that the audience does not have a chance to think or appreciating the problem.

The ability to control emotion defined as a power of inflaming viewer's enthusiasm, and gives them a chance to think and lets them realize the condition as what the speaker's advice and together reaching an agreement. So, the ability to control people's emotion is not the main purpose of persuasion. It is just the way to stimulate people, bring them into certain comfort condition where persuasion will be held.

Beside the important of control emotion, a speaker or persuader must able to provide some evident about their products. This evident is needed as a guarantee and to build a confident for conducting persuasion. So, by showing the evident and inflaming the people's emotion, persuader is easier to catch the purpose of persuasion.

In this research, it used six persuasive principle argued by Cialdini (2009). They are consistency principle, authority principle, reciprocity principle, social-evidence principle, preference principle, and rareness/scarcity principle.

Cialdini argues that human beings have a desire to be consistent and that we also value consistency in others. Consistency is a powerful social influence which is highly valued by society. The principle of commitment/consistency declares that we have a need to be seen as consistent and to honor our commitments. Once someone's mind is made up about an issue, stubborn consistency means that person does not have to think hard about the issue anymore (Cialdini, 2009).

Authority is a persuasive principle in which a persuader plays himself/ herself as if he/she were a powerful person. In this case, he/she was an American president candidate, for example, he/she must be able to convince the audiences or voters that he/she is a real president. He/she must be able to give a speech or solve the problems wisely, as if he/ she are a real president.

Cialdini's first principle states that humans are hardwired to want to return favors, pay back debts and to treat others as they have been treated. In essence, we prefer to say yes. According to Cialdini, there is no human society that doesn't practice this rule of reciprocity. It is a cultural standard that obligates us to return favors, gifts and invitations.

The reciprocity principle recognizes that people feel indebted to those who do something for them. This can lead us to feel obliged to offer concessions to others if they have been offered to us, in short to reciprocate, as we feel uncomfortable being indebted to others. If a colleague, for example, has offered help to you when you were under pressure to meet a deadline then you may feel obliged to support them when they need help.

Social-evidence influences peoples' decisions by informing them of that other individuals, maybe a role model, are or have observed this behavior. When people are

uncertain of how to behave, they look for the actions of others to guide their own actions. It is a principle in which group of society or a big number of people that is used as the evidence that the candidates are mostly preferred by the people.

Preference principle is applied by making a communication among the voters who have the same preferences or perception to the superiorities of the candidates. In line with this, the voters make a networking one another and give their supports to the candidates proposed by the persuaders.

The rareness/ scarcity principle is extremely powerful and operates on the value or worth that people attach to things. In economic theory, scarcity relates to supply and demand. The less there is of something, the more valuable it can become, as more people want it. Cialdini states that humans are challenged emotionally when freedoms are threatened and scarcity can limit free choice. This may cause people to want to try and possess the item more than ever.

METHODS

This study aimed to explain the observance of Cialdini's principles of speech act of persuasion in the 2016 United States presidential debates and to explain the pedagogical contribution of the findings on debate classes.

To achieve this aim, we used descriptive qualitative method. In this study, the subject was the utterance transcription performed by the candidates in 2016 US presidential debates. It would be taken from the official website of each party.

In collecting the data, I performed some steps which were related to the focuses of the study. They were as follow:

a. Finding the data related to presidential debates 2016. In this part, the writer took transcripts and videos relates to the presidential debates from each party, Democratic Party and Republican Party.

b. Watching and matching the video and the transcript After find the transcripts and the

videos of the data, the writer watched the video and matching the video with the transcripts.

c. Reading the transcript of the presidential debate repeatedly. After watching and matching, I read the transcripts several times to get the appropriate datum.

d. Identifying the utterances. The utterances were selected by classifying them based on the debate participant.

e. Selecting the utterances. The utterances were selected by classifying them into six persuasive principles, consistency, authority, reciprocity, social-evidence, preference/ liking, and rareness/ scarcity.

In order to validate the data, we used triangulation as a tool of the study (Meriam, 2002). Denzin (1970) as cited in Cohen et al (2005) distinguish triangulation into five, namely time triangulation, space triangulation, combined levels of triangulation, theoretical triangulation and investigator triangulation. In this study, we used investigator triangulation. The data of this thesis had been examined and judged by one of the lectures in local university in Bumiayu as the expert of appraisal. We worked independently in analyzing the data before we asked her to examine the findings. She gave us feedback and comments.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this section, this research informs about the findings resulted from the utterances produced by the candidates of 2016 US presidential debates.

Human beings tend, or at least, strive to be consistent in their actions, feelings or stances. Once he makes a decision, he will stick to his position even though he sometimes makes a mistake. That's the principle that underlies the principle of consistency. In the 2016 United States presidential debates, there was some consistency principle that the candidates made. The finding of consistency principle is summarized on the following table.

In the 2016 United States presidential debates, there was some consistency principle that the candidates made. On the first

presidential debate, Clinton applied 17 utterances that belong to consistency principle. Whereas trump was less than her, only 16 items of consistency principles.

Most of the persuasive utterances used in the first presidential debates reflect on consistency principle. That principle happens because persuasive acts always need honesty of the speaker to make the hearer convinced of what he/ she said.

From the second and third presidential debate, the candidates produced less in using consistency principles than in the first presidential debate. In the second presidential debate, Clinton used 6 utterances while Trump applied 3 utterances. Moreover, in the third presidential debate, Clinton produced only 1 and Trump also did.

The finding of consistency principle is summarized on the following table.

Table 1. Consistency Principle

Candidates	First presidential debate		Second presidential debate		Third presidential debate	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
	Clinton	17	51	6	67	1
Trump	16	49	3	33	17	95
TOTAL	33	100	9	100	18	100

In this way, both of the candidates used consistency principle by doing several things below:

- a. Talking about their hopes in the future.
- b. Asking the voters' need.
- c. Consistence with the past experience.

In observing authority principle, the utterances reflected in the imperatives or the shapes of directives speech acts. It means that if the candidates persuaded the voters/ audiences by saying instruction in directive ways.

The finding of authority principle can be seen on the table below.

Table 2. The Finding of Authority Principle

Candidate	First presidential debate		Second presidential debate		Third presidential debate	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Clinton	7	50	4	36	8	67
Trump	7	50	7	64	4	33
TOTAL	14	100	11	100	12	100

Here, the presidential candidates were asking the hearers/ voters/ American people to do something important/ crucial for the country. They used their power of authority as if the candidate was the real president.

The findings of reciprocity principle are summarized on the table below.

Table 3. Reciprocity Principle

Candidates	First presidential debate		Second presidential debate		Third presidential debate	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Clinton	11	49	9	43	9	50
Trump	12	51	12	57	9	50
TOTAL	23	100	21	100	18	100

In many social situations, reciprocity creates a feeling of obligation to repay someone in the future because of receiving something from others. By obligating the recipient to an act of future repayment, the rule of reciprocation allows one person to give something to another with the confidence that is not being lost. The mutually beneficial exchanges of our ancestors evolved into a sound interdependence among humans.

As a result, people were trained from an early age to comply with the rule of reciprocity. There is an obligation to give, an obligation to receive and an obligation to repay (Cialdini, 2009). Although the obligation to repay constitutes the essence of the reciprocity rule, it is the obligation to receive that makes the rule so easy to exploit. They definitely observed the

reciprocity principle of Cialdini in order to persuade the hearers or voters to be elected as the next president of United State. It proved by some data below:

- a. Making a promise or pledge
- b. Feeling obliged to give something in return

Social-evidence is a crucial thing in marketing, business or in the presidential debates. People will see, and then choose the candidate who is really impressing them. Social-evidence influences peoples' decisions by informing them of that other individuals, maybe a role model, are or have observed this behavior.

When people are uncertain of how to behave, they look for the actions of others to guide their own actions. It is a principle in which group of society or a big number of people that is used as the evidence that the candidates are mostly preferred by the people.

The finding of the social-evidence principle can be seen on the table below.

Table 4. Social-Evidence Principle

Candidates	First presidential debate		Second presidential debate		Third presidential debate	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Clinton	12	57	9	100	9	69
Trump	9	43	0	0	4	31
TOTAL	21	100	9	100	13	100

After analyzing the data, Clinton used 12 utterances of social-evidence principle in the first presidential debate. Clinton constantly produced the social-evidence principle on the second and third presidential debate. In other words, Trump on his second presidential debate did not observe the social-evidence principle.

The observance of this principle could be seen from the data below:

- a. Giving the past general evidence of American condition.
- b. Taking a model of the famous people/ State.

Preference is a principle that can create influence and compliance based on factors such as physical attractiveness or similarity. People

like to say yes to people they like. The 'halo effect' occurs when one positive characteristic dominates the way a person is viewed by others and is one of the oldest and most widely known psychological phenomenon (Cialdini, 2009).

This principle is applied by making a communication among the voters who have the same preferences or perception to the superiorities of the candidates. In line with this, the voters make a networking one another and give their supports to the candidates proposed by the persuaders.

The finding of the preference/ liking principle could be seen on the table below.

Table 5. Preference/ Liking Principle

Candidates	First presidential debate		Second presidential debate		Third presidential debate	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Clinton	5	63	3	75	2	33
Trump	3	37	1	25	4	67
TOTAL	8	100	4	100	6	100

In liking principle, the presidential candidates used similarity to observe the preference/ liking principle. They used the same liking to get the voters' attention.

The finding of the rareness/ liking principle could be seen on the following table.

Table 6. Rareness/ Scarcity Principle

Candidates	First presidential debate		Second presidential debate		Third presidential debate	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Clinton	16	38	4	29	8	50
Trump	26	62	10	71	8	50
TOTAL	42	100	14	100	16	100

To observe the rareness/ scarcity principle, they were doing several things such as:

- a. Blaming and disfiguring the interlocutor
- b. Proud of her/ himself

The important pedagogical suggestions attained from the findings for English debate classes is that in comparing the view of each candidate, providing some resources are really important to be concerned. From the findings, in giving social-evidence, the debater should be cleared and supported by a data or source of the evidence.

Moreover, the candidate also should apply good/ nice ethic in giving their speeches. Disfiguring the interlocutor is not appropriate to do in debate. The candidate may use the other scarcity principle by doing something new which gets the hearer/ the voters' attention.

The reason it pays off to learn more about persuasion in debate classes is that it will help the debater become more successful at achieving your goals. It's no more complicated than that. There's also an unstated assumption behind this reasoning: there are tested principles of persuasion that can be both learned and put to good use.

CONCLUSION

This study mainly concerns with the observance of persuasive principles produced by the United States presidential candidates. Having analyzed using the six principles of persuasive argued by Cialdini (2009), namely: consistency, authority, reciprocal, social-evidence, preference/ liking and rareness/ scarcity, the persuasive utterances used by the presidential candidates also aimed as the acts which were done in the six principles above.

After analyzing and discussing the result of the study above, it can be concluded that mostly the presidential candidate used those several principles. It was only found one principle that was not observed by trump on the second presidential debate, namely social-evidence principle.

There were some ways observing the persuasive principles. The objective of this principle was only to get the votes of the hearer/ the voters. First, in consistency principle, the presidential candidates were talking about their hopes in the future, asking the voters' need, and

consistence with the past experience. Second, in observing the authority principle, the presidential candidate used their authority by asking American people to reach something crucial/ important to the country. Third, from the findings are revealed that in observing the reciprocity principle the presidential candidates applied making a promise or pledge, feeling obliged to give something in return to attract the hearers/ the voters.

Moreover, in forth principle, giving the past general evidence of American condition and taking a model of the famous people/ state are the ways of the presidential candidates in observing the social-evidence principle. In this principle, Trump did not observe the social-evidence principle on the second presidential debate because he did not apply his speech.

Fifth, the presidential candidates used similarity to observe the preference/liking principle. At last, in the sixth principle that is rareness/scarcity principle, they used blaming and disfiguring the interlocutor and also they were proud of her/him in getting the hearers/ voters attentions/votes.

The reason in learning about persuasion in debate is that it will help the debater become successful at achieving the goals. The debaters should know about persuasion and how to persuade others. Persuading and being persuaded is part of being a member of society. But, persuasion is also a learned skill and like any skill, one can improve with instruction and practice. It is important to note that there are many long-lived debates regarding the ethics of using principles of persuasion.

REFERENCES

- Altikriti, S. 2016. Persuasive Speech Acts in Barack Obama's Inaugural Speeches (2009, 2013) and The Last State of the Union Address (2016). *International Journal of Linguistics*. Vol. 8, No. 2, ISSN: 1948-5425
- Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bu, J. 2010. *Study of Pragmatic Transfer in Persuasion Strategies by Chinese Learners of*

- English. 3L the Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, Vol. 16 (2)
- Cialdini, Robert B. 2009. *The Psychology Influence of Persuasion*. New York: Quill.
- Cohen, Louis et. al. 2005. *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge
- Cresswell, J.W. 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Cutting, J. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. USA, Canada: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2001. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Ghasani, I.B, and Sofwan, A. 2017. *Appraisal and Speech Structure of Contestants' Speeches in Speech Contest of ESA WEEK Competition*. *English Education Journal* 7 (2) (2017).
- Jarraya, S. 2013. *Persuasion in Political Discourse: Tunisian President Ben Ali's Last Speech as a case Study*. Thesis of Master of Arts in Linguistic Studies in the Graduate School of Syracuse University.
- Jary, Mark. 2010. *Assertion*. England: Palgrave Macmillan
- Lakoff, R. 1982. *Persuasive discourse and ordinary conversation, with examples from advertising*. In D. Tannen, (Eds), *Analysing discourse: Text and Talk* (pp. 239-311). Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Mujiyanto, Y. 2016. *The Verbal Politeness of Interpersonal Utterances Resulted from Back-Translating Indonesian Texts into English*. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 6 No. 2, January 2017, pp. 288-300.
- Pishghadam, R. and Rasouli, P. 2011. *A Cross-Linguistic Study of Persuasive Strategies Used in Persian and English Languages*. *African Journal of Education and Technology*, Vol.1, No. 2. Pp. 52-60. ISSN 2045-8452.
- Pishghadam, R. and Rasouli, P. 2011. *Persuasive Strategies among Iranian EFL Learners*. *Studies in Literature and Language*, Vol.3, No. 2, pp. 111-117. ISSN 1923-1563.
- Quinn, Simon. 2005. *Debating*. Brisbane, Australia.
- Rohmahwati, A. and Yuliasri, I. 2017. *Violation of Politeness Maxims in The Television Series The Big Bang Theory*. *English Education Journal* 7 (1) (2017).
- Searle, J. R. 1979. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. California: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J.R. 1999. *Mind, Language and Society: Philosophy in The World*. Phoenix: Guernsey Press Co.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.