

Speech Acts and Politeness in Nixon and Bush's Victory Speech: A Pragmatic study

Tha'er Adnan Jameel. University of Anbar. College of Education for Humanities. Department of English.
adnanthair81@uoanbar.edu.iq

Assist. Prof. Imad Hayif Sameer. University of Anbar. College of Education for Humanities. Department of English. ed.emad.samir@uoanbar.edu.iq

DOI: [10.31973/aj.v2i138.1738](https://doi.org/10.31973/aj.v2i138.1738)

Abstract

This study is primarily concerned with examining the speech acts and politeness strategies manifested in American presidential victory speech. The study aims at showing the applicability of both Searle's classification of speech acts and Leech's politeness maxims appeared in this genre by finding out the frequency and percentage of the two types. Then, analyzing the variation of these types among the selected samples. The research follows a mixed method of analysis as both qualitative and quantitative methods are used. It has been concluded that four forms of Searle's illocutionary acts have appeared in American presidential victory speech. These acts are assertives, expressives, directives and commissives, while declaration speech acts have never been used by the selected candidates. Regarding politeness theory, it has been found that approbation and agreement have the most frequent occurrence in this genre compared to the other maxims.

Key Words: Speech acts, Politeness, Victory speech, Political Discourse

1. Introduction

Language is a powerful means of life, affecting on both individual and collective levels of humans. Language is also employed as a form of circulation to negotiate social, transactional, religious as well as political situations around us. Political language, as seen by Zheng (2000:2), gives less information about the truth of things, therefore, users need to be more manipulative, hedgy, and tricky. As a result, politicians hide themselves behind these skills in order not to bind themselves to any obligations and they use various pragmatic skills to express their beliefs and feelings.

Political discourse is determined commonly by who speaks to whom, on what occasion and on what goals, not only explained by a topic or a style (Van Dijk: 2002, 225). So, political language is a

highly functional means produced by various functions or speech acts e.g. greeting, promising, threatening ...etc.

This study is conducted to point out the speech acts and politeness strategies used in the American presidential victory speeches. It is worth mentioning that victory speech is part of political discourse and can be simply defined as the speech presented by a new-elect candidate, who wins the American presidential elections. This genre is one of the most important rituals in American culture and it is similar to oratory or rhetoric speech which is defined by Crystal (2003:416) in his dictionary as "the speech or writing that is meant to make a powerful influence in public".

2. Literature Review:

Language use is an increasingly important area in human communication, as such studying pragmatic concepts is the fundamental base on which this study is laid. Thereby, this section tackles the theoretical background beginning a general view of the term pragmatics with a brief focus on the primary concern of this study i.e. speech acts and politeness, referring to their theories and principles. Then, some related previous studies will be shown.

Pragmatics, in simple words, refers to the study of language use. It dates back to the philosophy of language introduced by the American linguist Charles W. Morris who defines pragmatics as "one of the three principle dimensions of semiotics along with syntax and semantics, as syntax is involved with the formal relations of signs". For semantics, it is the relation between the sign and object it signifies, whereas pragmatics is concerned with the relations between signs and their users. (Morris, 1938: 6) cited in (Levinson, 1983:2).

Yule (1996:3) indicates that pragmatics is the study of meaning as delivered by speakers and understood by listeners. According to Mey (2001:6), pragmatics is "the study of the use of language in human communication as decided by the conditions of the society". For Crystal (2003:379), pragmatics is the study of the elements that dominate human's choice of words through speech or writing. This means that if someone wants to say something s/he puts in consideration all the elements and situational contexts in order to produce the proper language.

Likewise, Huang (2007: 2) follows Levinson's definition of pragmatics since he explains that "pragmatics is the systematic study of meaning depending on language use and the key aspects of pragmatics are implicature, presupposition, speech acts and deixis". The last definition summarizes the branches or notions ramified from the term pragmatics, (scope) as such, speech acts and politeness will be given more details in the next sections since they are the core of this study.

2.1. Speech acts

The theory of speech acts is one of the most essential principles in pragmatics. It was introduced by the British philosopher Austin. The basic ideas of this theory were based on Austin's lectures which were published after his death by his students under the title "How to do Things with Words". The father of pragmatics and speech act theory, Austin, argues that studying language should not deal with grammar and its truth conditions but also study the various functions represented by the use of various speech acts. These functions include inviting, promising, requesting, apologizing, thanking, etc. (Austin, 1975: 375; Searle, et al., 1980: vii).

According to Crystal (2003:446), speech act is "a sub-field of pragmatics concerned with the ways in which words can be used not only to present information but also to carry out actions". Like the other notions of pragmatics, the core idea is the utterance's meaning not the sentence meaning, in other words, the focus is on the speakers' intention not on the literal meaning of a sentence. Through developing his theory of speech act, Austin distinguishes two types of utterances; performatives and constatives. Later, Austin reclassifies his previous dichotomy of classifying speech acts into constatives and performatives. He regards constatives as a distinct class of performatives. Thus, such distinction will not be sustained. Hence, he states that an utterance performs special acts by means of special communicative force of the utterance. Austin concludes that all utterances have both performative and constative components. So, they represent all sayings and actions simultaneously. As a result, Austin proposes the threefold classification related to speech acts namely locutions, illocutions and Perlocutions. (Austin, 1962:94)

Locutionary act simply means the production of meaningful linguistic expressions, or it is the act of uttering speech, by using particular words and grammatical rules in a particular language. Illocutionary act is the most important act which refers to the function or the purpose of saying something. It is the action that a speaker wants to fulfill in producing an utterance. whereas, the third act simply refers to the effects of saying or uttering something on the listeners or audience. A perlocutionary act is an act that illocutions exert on the addressee. Unlike illocutionary acts, perlocutions are not under the full control of the speaker as they are not usually observed unless the utterance has been made. (Austin:1962)

Austin (1962:150-151) suggests a model of speech acts consisting of five types depending on their illocutionary force:

1) **Verdictives:**

These classes of verbs can be used to give verdicts or judgments. They are exercises of judgment.

2) Exercitives:

These verbs represent the act of exercising power, influence or rights. They are acts of giving decisions. E.g., “I sentence you ten years in prison”.

3) Commissives:

They are verbs that commit the speakers to do or say something later. These forms used to express intention in future or giving promises.

4) Behabitives:

These verbs are used to express attitudinal or social behavior, such as apologizing, congratulating, condoling, etc.

5) Expositives:

These verbs show how specific utterances fit into the course of conversation. They are involved in explaining views or arguments, such as hypothesizing, assuming, expecting and the like.

Another important classification of Speech acts type is that related to Searle (1969) who is a student of John Austin at Oxford in the 1950s. According to Searle’s philosophy, a speaker who wants to generate an illocutionary force has to follow several conditions or semantic rules, corresponding to Austin’s felicity conditions. Thus, Searle’s contribution was to establish a set of rules to disambiguate the anomalous utterances. Searle suggests four categories of conditions governing the felicitousness of illocutionary acts. They are (propositional content conditions, preparatory conditions, sincerity conditions, essential conditions) (Searle,1969:63)

Therefore, Searle’s taxonomy of speech acts is divided into five types:

1. Representatives or (Assertives)

These speech acts are the types of speech acts which commit the speakers to do something being the case or to commit speakers to the truth of propositional expression. They express the speaker’s belief that makes the words fit the world of belief. Verbs of this kind involve: (suggesting, claiming, stating, asserting, complaining, reporting, etc.).

2. Directives:

They are the acts that make the addressee perform the action, (to 'direct' him or her towards some goal) or they are the speaker’s attempts to get the hearer to do or say something. Verbs of this kind include (asking, commanding, ordering, advising, questioning and requesting).

3. Commissives:

They are the acts that commit the speaker to do things in the future. The verbs here encompass (offer, refusal, promise, threat, vow and the like). Searle (1977: 35) calls it 'unexceptionable' since it operates a change in the world by means of creating an obligation;

however, this obligation is created in the speaker, not in the hearer. In the Commissives, the world is adapted to the words via speakers themselves.

4. Expressives:

These acts are concerned with the speaker's psychological states or attitudes, or they express the speaker's feelings about something. For Mey (1993: 165), these speech acts express an inner state of the speaker which is essentially subjective and says nothing about the world. Expressive verbs include; (thanking, blaming, apologizing, congratulating, etc.)

5. Declarations:

They are the acts which effect or change the current state of the worlds in an immediate way. In this act, the speaker effects on the correspondence between propositions and the world. They include verbs such as (declaring war, nominating a candidate, firing from work, etc.).

However, Searle's taxonomy of speech acts is based on various dimensions. These dimensions will be summarized into four, they are: (Searle, 1969: 54-64)

- i. **Illocutionary point:** It refers to the point or purpose of an illocution form. Illocutionary point is a part of illocutionary force but it is different from it. Therefore, the illocutionary point of request for instance, is the same as that of a command, in the sense that both attempt to get a hearer to do something. But the illocutionary force is completely different. Generally, one can say that illocutionary force is the result of many elements of which illocutionary point is only one, though, it is the most important one.
- ii. **Direction of fit:** the relationship between word (language) and the world (reality). Thus, the 'fit' is between a language and reality, and it can be interpreted either from language to reality, or from reality to language, so, we either 'word the world', i.e. language is fitted to reality or 'world the word', i.e. reality is fitted to language.
- iii. **Expressed psychological state:** It refers to the attitudes and feelings expressed by the speaker when performing illocutionary acts.
- iv. **Propositional content:** It simply refers to the part of sentence meaning which can be reduced to a proposition. This concept allows semanticists to assert that different types of sentences may share the same propositional content; the propositional content is in the essence concerned with what the speech act is about even though they differ in other aspects of meaning. Propositions might be true or false, might be known, believed,

or even doubted, asserted or denied, and might be held constantly under paraphrasing and translation. (Huang,2007: 12)

2.2. Politeness Theory

Politeness is one of the most interesting topics in linguistics studies, boomed newly, namely, the last three decades. It is not a natural phenomenon since none is said to be inherently im/polite. (Leech, 1983:83) The interpretation of the term politeness is still a point of controversy, whether it belongs to pragmatics or to sociolinguistics. Some linguists put politeness under the umbrella of pragmatics such as Leech (1983), whereas others believe that politeness is a sociolinguistic notion, like Labov (1972).

As for the approach followed in this study, the focus will be on politeness from the pragmatic points of view. Lakoff (1973) is the first linguist who focused on pragmatic politeness, namely within the field of linguistic competence. She connects politeness with Gricean cooperative principles. She also makes use of these principles by creating a set of rules of using politeness. Thus, she is regarded as “the mother of modern politeness theory”. (Eelen 2001: 2) Leech (2014:108) also is one of the influential scholars who links politeness to the pragmatic level, asserting that politeness is not associated with the utterance outside its context in use.

Besides, Lakoff (1977:88) suggests three rules of politeness:

1. **Formality rule**, i.e. don't impose on others or keeping aloof.
2. **Hesitancy rule**, i.e. allowing the addressee to give more options.
3. **Equality rule**, i.e. the two interlocutors are equal or feeling good.

The above mentioned rules depend totally on the contextual conditions of a conversation. Thus, the focus will be on: the differences between interlocutors, the degree of familiarity between speakers and hearers and on cultural aspects of an utterance. These conditions are very basic in shaping im/politeness. (Reiter,2000:8)

Linguists and theorists proposed various forms of politeness theory. The most prominent, and the one which is adopted in the analysis of this study is Leech's (1983) politeness model.

Leech is one of the prominent figures in the field of pragmatics. He proposes a way of defining politeness in terms of conversational exchanges. The goal behind this theory is to show the interaction of cooperative principles with politeness principles (henceforth PP) through interpreting indirect speech acts. As such, politeness principles are concerned with conversational participants; self S and other H, where S refers to a speaker and H represents a hearer or third party. Whether present or not, a third party should always be addressed politely by the speaker. (Leech,1983:26)

Leech presents the Politeness Principle (PP) along the following lines:

"Minimize (all things being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs (negative politeness); Maximize (all things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs (positive politeness)." (Leech, 1983:131)

However, Leech identifies six maxims of politeness, each maxim underlies two sub-maxims; *a* and *b*. These maxims are essential as Leech claims, to 'elucidate the relationship between sense and force in human speech'.

As a result, Leech compares PP with Grice's cooperative principles, rescuing the explanation that why people usually do not observe the maxims of Grice. The good evidence he shows is that people **do** reply consciously on the reflections of politeness, for example, people will explicitly identify the fact that they do not intend to notice politeness standards (Thomas, 1995: 159).

The six maxims are the following:

1. Tact maxim (in directive and commissive):

a. "Minimize cost to other" Meaning that decreasing the expressions of beliefs that involve costing others.

b. "Maximize benefit to other" Meaning that increasing the expressions of beliefs that imply benefit to other'.

2. Generosity maxim (in directive and commissive):

a- "Minimize benefit to self" This means decreasing the impressions or beliefs that express benefit to self.

b- "Maximize cost to self" It implies increasing the expressions showing cost to self.

3. Approbation maxim (in expressive and assertive).

a- "Minimize dispraise of other" Meaning that to reduce using the words and expressions showing dispraise of other.

b- "Maximize praise of other" It implies increasing the expressions and beliefs showing praise of other.

4. Modesty maxim (in expressive and assertive)

a- "Minimize praise of self" It indicates reducing the use of words and expressions displaying praise of self.

b- "Maximize dispraise of self" This means maximizing the expressions and beliefs referring to dispraise of self.

5. Agreement maxim (in assertive)

a- "Minimize disagreement between self and other" this sub-maxim indicates the decrease in using words and expressions showing disagreement between speaker and listener.

b- "Maximize agreement between self and other" This sub-maxim maximizes the expressions that show agreement between participants.

6. Sympathy maxim (in assertive)

a-"minimize antipathy between self and other". Minimizing the expressions of beliefs implying antipathy between speaker and listener.

b- "Maximize sympathy between self and other" Maximizing the expressions of beliefs implying sympathy between self and other.

Accordingly, all the above mentioned maxims focus on the polite expressions rather than the impolite ones. These rules or maxims are simply described as the statements of standards which speakers might follow. As such, the first four maxims deal with bipolar ratings, so they are used in pairs; e.g. "cost-benefit and praise-dispraise" scales, whereas the last two maxims have a single pole relation e.g. the agreement and sympathy scales. (Leech,1983: 132-133)

As for the interrelationship between Searle's (1969) and Leech's (1983) models, Leech (1983:104-109) states implicitly that the relationship between speech act and politeness lies in the fact that negative politeness goes hand in hand principally with the directive class, whereas positive politeness is established principally in the expressive and commissive classes of speech acts. Assertives are regarded as neutral politeness and based on their context. While declarations rarely involve politeness since they are normally performed by some specific speakers who have the authority to do things like judging offenders, christening babies or naming ships.

Another relation between the maxims of politeness and speech acts is precisely justified in terms of indirectness. The indirectness shows the asymmetric relation between the hearer and the speaker in the sense that what is perceived as polite with respect to the hearer or to other third party will be impolite with respect to the speaker, and vice versa. (Leech, 1983:107)

2.3 Previous Studies:

Studying speech acts and politeness has been tackled in some previous studies by different researchers. In this section, the writer will present four studies, two of them are related to speech act theory, while the other two are related to politeness. The researcher will outline these studies, then, compare them with his study showing the dissimilarities and gaps which this study tries to show.

The first study is an article entitled "**A Pragmatic Analysis of Victory and Inaugural speeches of president Umaru Musa Yar' Adua**". It is conducted by Ayeomoni O. and Akinkuolere O. (2012). The study is conducted to identify the speech acts features of the Nigerian president "Umaru Yar Adua's victory and inaugural speeches". It aims at determining the patterns of pragmatics in political speeches and giving the frequencies and percentages of

speech acts. The researchers then, analyze these features in terms of their contextual settings.

The data of this study is composed of two speeches of the president Umaru; the first sample is a victory speech whereas the second is inaugural's namely the first two speeches of the president Umaru in 2007. The linguistic notion of analyzing this study based on both Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) models of speech acts.

The findings of the study prove that representatives are the most recurring speech acts used by Umaru, rating 60% of the total percentages. Verdictives come in the second level rating 40%. Directives come thirdly taking 35%, while Commissives are fourthly with 30%. Finally, declaratives have the lesser usage with 20% of the overall percentage of speech acts.

The second study is also an article accomplished by Pakzadian M. (2012) entitled "**politeness principles in 2008 presidential debates between Mc Cain and Obama**". The study aims to investigate the pragmatic theories implying politeness principles. The researcher focuses her study on comparing three presidential debates between McCain, the republican candidate, and Obama, the democratic candidate in 2008's election debate. The researcher then tries to examine to what extent the two candidates knit more to Leech's six maxims of politeness.

The results of Pakzadian's (2012) study show that politeness is a very common feature in presidential debates mainly in 2008's campaign. Another finding is that in all three debates, Obama progresses to McCain in applying all six maxims of Leech's politeness within his speech.

The third study is a thesis entitled "**An analysis of politeness strategy in Barack Obama's victory speech**". This thesis is submitted by Sari, Y. (2016) to investigate the politeness principles in Obama's victory speech. The study aims at knowing how Obama used politeness strategies in his victory speech. The researcher analyzes the given sample according to Brown and Livenson's politeness model, focusing on both positive and negative strategies used by Obama as a new elected president of the United States of America. The method of the study is qualitative one since the writer tries to analyze politeness strategies and the idea of face threatening acts appeared in Obama's speech.

Sari (2016) concluded that politeness strategies are very important phenomena used in this kind of speeches. Moreover, politeness is regarded as the means by which words and utterances link the speaker and listeners together. Another result is that Obama was highly reasonable in using different types of politeness strategies and the concept of FTA. The focus was highly on positive politeness

strategies such as joking, giving sympathy, intensity of interest, exaggerating, cooperating and understanding. But, negative politeness is used just to show deference.

The title of the fourth study is "**speech acts and communication strategies used by Donald Trump's campaign in Tampa, Florida**". This study is also an MA thesis by Kurniawan, M. (2017). It aims at identifying speech acts and communication in Trump's speech through his campaign in Florida. In American political system, two candidates usually compete on declaring and showing their missions and political programs in order to persuade the audience. Thus, the researcher tries to find out the acts and strategies used by Trump in this genre. The analysis of this study will be based on Austin's (1962) illocutionary acts and Brown and Livenson's (1978) politeness theory. The writer regards politeness as one form of communication strategies.

The findings of Kurniawan's (2017) study shows that there are 19 illocutionary acts in the given speech. Commissives are the mostly used acts by Trump in his campaign since these acts are used to attract and influence the audience. Regarding the comparison with other types, commissives and then exercitives are the mostly used acts in Trump's campaign. On the other hand, positive politeness is the most frequent form of politeness strategies used by Trump when making promises or getting sympathy of the audience. Off- record strategy is also another tactic used by Trump in order to perform acts and to help him understate the antagonist candidate e.g. Clinton.

To compare this study with the above mentioned ones, the researcher focuses on gaps and differences which are not tackled previously. The first and most important one the following study deals with both speech acts and politeness theories based on Leech's (1983:105) arguments whether speech acts involve politeness or not. The researcher also tries to compare two speeches said by different new- elect presidents at different periods of time.

3. Methodology

The data of this study are based on the American presidential victory speech. Victory speech is a form of political speeches used mainly in American culture as a norm that a winner candidate presents in front of his advocate voters at the election night. Two speeches were picked out related to two candidates. They are Richard Nixon and George W. Bush. The choice is not fulfilled randomly, but it undergoes specific criteria; such as the national and international political circumstances at the time of election and the ethnic and economic background of a candidate since money and power are very essential elements affecting the campaigners' choice of words in American society.

After reading the transcripts and watching them deeply on YouTube, the type of speech act and the politeness maxim of each sentence are determined. Later, one sample of each type of speech acts from each candidate's speech is randomly selected for the analysis.

The method of analysis used in this study is a mixed methods approach i.e. combining qualitative and quantitative procedures. Thus, the researcher describes the use of speech acts and politeness strategies in the given sample qualitatively. On the other hand, he uses a quantitative method to show the frequencies and percentages of speech acts and politeness maxims occurring in each victory speech in isolation as well as combined.

As far as counting the percentages is concerned, a descriptive statistical way is applied since the researcher proposes a formula based on the number of tokens of each speech act type individually, multiplied by 100 and then divided by the total number of speech act types (SATs) in each speech. The same method is applied to find out the percentages of politeness maxims (PMs).

The formula is summarized as follows:

$$\frac{\text{SAT or PM No. of}}{\text{Total No. of SATs}} \times 100$$

After obtaining the frequencies and percentages of speech act types and politeness maxims for each speech sample chosen, the results will be discussed, compared and concluded.

4. Analysis:

This section sets forth the analysis adopted in this study, in which two victory speeches of two American new-elected presidents will be examined. The selected data is related to Richard Nixon and George W. Bush. The analysis will be based on both Searle's (1969) dichotomy of speech acts and Leech's (1983) classification of politeness principles.

4.1 The Analysis of Nixon's Speech

4.1.1 Assertives:

In his speech, Nixon uses (21) assertive speech acts, rating (65.5 %) out of (32) that is the total number of speech acts. One speech act will be chosen randomly to be analyzed.

"The important thing in our process, however, is to play the game. And in the great game of life, and particularly the game of politics"

❖ Speech act discussion:

Based on the following four dimensions of Searle's (1969) speech acts taxonomy, the above extract 'NA' is regarded as assertive

speech act. This technique will be applicable to all the following speeches:

The illocutionary point of this sentence is claiming, since Nixon believes that politics is like a game and players (participants) of this game should do their best in order to win. Concerning the direction of fit, it is a word-to-world since Nixon tries to fit his claim, that politics is a game, to the audience. The psychological state is "belief" as Nixon wants the listeners to make believe of his claim. Finally, the propositional content of this sentence is based on Nixon's characterization of winning the election. As it is a great victory in the game of politics.

❖ **Politeness maxim discussion:**

Leech (1983) categorizes assertives with four maxims of politeness, the appropriate choice is due to the sub-maxim related to the given data.

Thus, this sentence falls into "Agreement Maxim" of Leech's politeness principles. As Nixon maximizes the expressions of agreement to the audience, trying to tell them that this victory is the result of their confidence and cooperation as one team.

4.1.2 Expressives:

In his victory speech, Nixon uses only (5) expressive speech acts, rating (15.6 %) out of (32) the total number of speech acts. One expressive SA will be chosen randomly to be analyzed.

" Good evening my fellow Americans "

❖ **Speech act discussion:**

The illocutionary point of this sentence is greeting, since Nixon greets the people who were waiting his arrival to celebrate the election's victory. Concerning the direction of fit, there is no direction of fit between the word e.g. Nixon's speech and the world e.g. reality.

The psychological state is "joy" because Nixon when says this sentence wants to express his emotions of welcome to the audience.

Finally, the propositional content of this utterance is to show the equality or fellowship between the new- elected president and people, delivered via Nixon's greeting to his supporters.

❖ **Politeness maxim:**

The sentence is expressed politely, and it falls into "Approbation Maxim" of Leech's politeness. In his greeting, Nixon maximizes the expressions of praise to the audience who gave their votes to him. At the same time, Nixon indirectly shows modesty when he uses the negative sub-maxim in which he minimizes praise of self. Thus, he addresses the audience as " my fellow" although he wins the presidential election and becomes the president of the united states.

4.1.3 Directives:

In his victory speech, Nixon uses only (4) directive speech acts out of (32) rating (12.5%) of the total percentage of speech acts. One of these directives will be chosen randomly to be analyzed.

" And now that the election is over, it is time to get on with the great tasks that lie before us"

❖ **Speech act discussion:**

The illocutionary point of this sentence is asking, since Nixon asks the American people to work together in order to complete the task. Concerning **the direction of fit**, it has a world-to-word direction as Nixon uses this sentence trying to change the world according to his direction.

The psychological state refers to Nixon's desire or "wish" that listeners have to complete the task that lies ahead.

Finally, **the propositional content** of this utterance refers to the mission that lies before Americans in the next four years. The newly elected president asks for the audience's help to accomplish the task.

❖ **Politeness maxim:**

The sentence is expressed politely, as Nixon avoids the imperative mood in his asking using the initiator " it is time to". This sentence falls into "**Tact Maxim**" of Leech's politeness. Nixon uses the positive sub-maxim when he maximizes benefit to the audience, saying that there is a great task lays ahead and should be accomplished by all people to gain the valuable things of America.

4.1.4 Commissives:

In his victory speech, Nixon uses only (2) commissives out of (32) the total number of speech acts in Nixon's victory speech. Commissives rate (6%) of the total percentage of Nixon's speech acts. One of the two acts will be chosen to be analyzed.

" I tried to conduct myself in this campaign in a way that would not divide our country — not divide it regionally or by parties or in any other way "

❖ **Speech act discussion:**

The illocutionary point of this sentence is pledge since Nixon commits himself to unite American people, making no difference between one region and another or between one party and another.

Concerning **the direction of fit**, it is a world-to-word direction as Nixon thinks that Americans in specific and the whole world are really in need to such pledge at that time to stop wars and begin new era of peace and union. **The psychological state** is "intention" since the new elected president has in mind such commitment even before his victory. Finally, **the propositional content** of this utterance refers to the plan or intention uttered by Nixon towards his supporters that he will never let his country to be separated into small groups or parties.

❖ **Politeness maxim:** The sentence is expressed in a polite way, and it falls into "**Generosity Maxim**" of Leech (1983) politeness as Nixon will exert the utmost efforts however he costs himself (maximizing cost to self) in order not to allow the division of his country.

4.2 The Analysis of Bush's Speech:

4.2.1 Assertives:

In his speech, Bush uses (30) assertive speech acts out of (64) which is the total number of speech acts. The frequency rate is (46.8 %) of the total percentage of speech acts. One of these assertive SAs will be chosen randomly to be analyzed.

"Our military has brought justice to the enemy and honor to America. "

❖ **Speech act discussion:**

The illocutionary point of this sentence is claiming since Bush claims that the wars of Iraq and Afghanistan achieved their goals and America had triumphed over 'terrorism'. Concerning **the direction of fit**, it is a word-to-world because the Bush's words, specifically at this moment, are purposeful since he tries to fabricate a justification for his wars.

The psychological state is "belief " since Bush wants the listeners to make believe of his claim. Finally, **the propositional content** of this sentence shows how Bush tries to gather approvals of his false decisions that lead to thousands of victims and injuries within American soldiers claiming that they fight to bring honor to America.

❖ **Politeness maxim:**

Bush's claim tends to be neutral politeness since it depends on the truth value of Bush's words. Simply, we can relate this sentence into "**Approbation Maxim**" of Leech's politeness principles. As Bush in this utterance maximizes the praise to American military saying that they brought justice to the enemy as well as honor to America.

4.2.2 Expressives:

In his victory speech, Bush uses (21) expressive speech acts out of (64) which is the total number whose rate is (33 %) of the total percentage of speech acts. One of them will be chosen randomly to be analyzed.

"and I'm humbled by the trust and the confidence of my fellow citizens "

❖ **Speech act discussion:**

The illocutionary point of this sentence shows Bush's feeling of proud since he reflects his emotional state resultant from the trust earned by American voters. Concerning **the direction of fit**, Bush's utterance has no direction of fit.

The psychological state of the elected president reflects his feeling of "joy" for the degree that makes him confess his humbleness. Finally, **the propositional content** of this utterance gives some sort of gratitude and praise for the people who trust Bush and give him their voices.

❖ **Politeness maxim:**

The sentence is expressed politely. According to Leech, Expressives fall either under approbation or modesty maxim. Thus, this sentence falls into "**modesty Maxim**" of politeness, as Bush, through his utterance, minimizes praise for self when he revealed his humbleness towards his supporters whom trust Bush and gave him their votes.

4.2.3 Directives:

Bush uses only (2) directive speech acts out of (64). The rate is (3%) of the total percentage of speech acts used in his victory speech. One of these two acts will be analyzed bellow.

"To make this nation stronger and better, I will need your support "

❖ **Speech act discussion:**

The illocutionary point of this sentence is a request since Bush asks politely those who did not elect him to approach his new project for the sake of America.

Concerning **the direction of fit**, it has a world-to-word direction as Bush smartly chooses such occasion to invite his opponents to work together. **The psychological state** is "wish" of Bush to approach the opposed people.

Finally, **the propositional content** of this sentence is based on Bush's claiming that it is the most appropriate chance to come across his antagonists as well as his supporters and asks them to work together in governing this nation.

❖ **Politeness maxim:**

This sentence is uttered politely when Bush softens his request in order to minimize cost to others. Thus, the sentence falls into "**Tact Maxim**" of politeness. Moreover, Bush highlights his need when he begins his request with the results or benefits people will gain if they support Bush in the mission ahead.

4.2.4 Commissives:

In his victory speech, Bush uses (11) commissive speech acts out of (64) rating (17%) of the total percent of speech acts. One of these commissives will be chosen randomly to be analyzed.

"We'll help the emerging democracies of Iraq and Afghanistan so they can grow in strength and defend their freedom"

❖ **Speech act discussion:**

The illocutionary point of this sentence is promising since Bush commits himself to help Iraqi and Afghani people in order to be able to defend their claimed "freedom".

Concerning **the direction of fit**, it is a world-to-word direction as Bush intentionally tries to justify his wars linking his victory in the presidential election with the military invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan. **The psychological state** is 'an intention' as Bush intends to send a message to all opponents regarding wars outside America.

Finally, **the propositional content** of this utterance is based on a claim or a plea that there are new emerging democracies in both Iraq and Afghanistan.

❖ **Politeness maxim:**

The sentence is expressed in a polite way and it falls into "**Tact Maxim**" of politeness since Bush relies on the positive sub-maxim which means "maximizing benefit to other". In this sentence 'other' refers not only to the audience but to the third party i.e. Iraqi and Afghani people to whom Bush directs his promise.

5. Results and Discussions:

Table (1) Nixon and Bush's SAs

Speech Acts Type	Nixon		Bush	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Assertives	21	65.6 %	30	46.8 %
Expressives	5	15.5 %	21	33 %
Directives	4	12.5 %	2	3 %
Commissives	2	6 %	11	17 %
Declarations	-	-	-	-
Total	32	100 %	64	100 %

As can be seen in table (1), Nixon and Bush's victory speeches seem to have the same order in the sense that both new-elected presidents base highly on assertive SAs but with different percentages. The reason may simply belong to the fact that the two presidents are regarded as war-time presidents, therefore, they make use of the victory celebration to assert and claim their projects. Thus, Nixon focuses his speech mostly on the term "peace" linking his speech with one great goal that is establishing peace not only for America but for the whole world, whereas, Bush focuses on his useless wars in Iraq and Afghanistan trying to find out legitimacy to these wars. Expressives SAs come secondly in the two speeches as it is a natural way for a candidate to show his thanks and gratitude, although Bush's rate of using expressives is higher than Nixon's. The reason simply belongs to frequent co-occurrence of the utterance "I want to thank" that is repeated ten times in Bush's speech. He employs about two

paragraphs to thank everyone contributed in his winning of the presidential election.

On the other hand, the table clearly shows dissimilar use of commissive SAs where Nixon uses only two commissives rating 6% of the total percentage of SAs. The reason of such lack in giving promises or pledges may belong to Nixon's apprehension that he could not be able to fulfill them. This fear is related to the difficult situation of American military forces in Vietnam, and his success totally depends on ending this war. On the contrary, Commissives in Bush's victory speech come thirdly rating 17 %. As the fifth paragraph of Bush's speech is allocated for giving promises regarding economic and social affairs in America. Directives have the lest use by the two presidents. While declarations are not used at all in the two speeches.

Table (2) Nixon and Bush's PPs

Politeness Principles	Nixon		Bush	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Tact	5	15.6 %	9	14 %
Generosity	1	3 %	4	6 %
Approbation	12	37.5%	33	51.5 %
Modesty	0	-	1	1.5 %
Agreement	13	40.5 %	15	23 %
Sympathy	1	3 %	2	3 %
Total	32	100 %	64	100 %

Based on the statistics summarized in table (2), agreement in Nixon's speech is used (14) times whose frequency rate is (40.5%) while approbation is repeated (13) rating (37.5%). The priority of using agreement maxim in Nixon's speech seems to be related to his wish in unifying the national and international opinion to end war. Such decision needs a wise presidency that helps in maximizing agreement between the president and his public on the one hand, and between American government and other countries in the world on the other hand.

On the other side, the order and percentage of Leech's politeness maxims in Bush's speech are as follows; Approbation 51.5 %, Agreement 23 %, Tact 14 %, Generosity 6 %, Sympathy 3 % and Modesty 1.5 %. Unlike Nixon, Bush's main concern regarding politeness strategies based on praising others and avoid saying unpleasant things about them. These principles were clearly enhanced by the high rate of using assertives and expressives in Bush's speech, as according to Leech (1983) approbation maxim is manifested in both assertive and expressive speech acts.

Generosity and sympathy maxims have an equal use since each principle is used only once in Nixon's speech. Tact occurs (5) times

rating 15.6% throughout Nixon's speech with an equal rate that of Bush's i.e. 14 %. Modesty maxim is not used utterly by Nixon while it is used once by Bush. Such result shows a mutual relation between the two presidents in the sense that they avoid being modest since they are war-time candidates and they may be effected by the political affairs.

6. Conclusions:

According to the results shown in the previous section, it is concluded that four types of Searle's classification of speech acts appeared in this genre i.e. assertives, expressives, commissives and directives. Assertive is the mostly frequent type used by the two selected presidents, without any single appearance of declarations that are never been used by the two candidates.

As for politeness principles, approbation and agreement are the most frequently used maxims than the other four ones. The choice of politeness maxim is highly related to both; speech acts type and contextual events. The new- elected presidents try to show themselves more polite by using indirect speech acts, especially in the case of directives, to minimize cost to the people.

7. References

Austin, J.L. (1962) **How to do things with words**. London: Oxford University Press.

Austin, J.L. (1975) **How To Do Things With Words**, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press

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

Crystal, D. (2003). **A dictionary of linguistics & phonetics** (5th ed). Blackwell Pub.

Eelen, G. (2001). **A critique of politeness theories**. St. Jerome Pub.

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/nov/04/uselections2004.usa17>

<https://edition.cnn.com/videos/politics/2016/11/08/donald-trump-entire-victory-speech-election-sot.cnn>

<https://www.nytimes.com/1972/11/08/archives/transcript-of-nixons-victory-speech.html>

<https://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/04/us/politics/04text-obama.html>

Huang, Y. (2007). **Pragmatics**. Oxford University Press.

Labov, W. (1972). **Sociolinguistic Patterns**. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lakoff R T (1973) **The logic of politeness; or, minding your p's and c's**. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago.

Lakoff R T (1977) **Politeness, pragmatics and performatives**. In Rogers A, Wall B, Murphy J (eds) *Proceedings of the Texas*

Conference on Performatives, Presupposition and Implicature. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D. C, pp79-106

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

Leech, G. N. (2014). **The pragmatics of politeness**. Oxford University Press.

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

Mey (2001). **Pragmatics: An introduction** (2nd ed). Blackwell Publishers.

Reiter, R. M. (2000). **Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies**. John Benjamins Publishing

Searle, J. (1969). **Speech acts**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J., Kiefer, F. and Bierwisch, M. (Eds.) (1980). **Speech act theory and pragmatics**. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing

Thomas, J. (1995). **Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics**. Longman

Van Dijk (2002). **Political discourse and Political Cognition** (P. A. Chilton & C. Schaffner, Eds.; pp. 203–237).

Yule, G. (1996). **Pragmatics**. Oxford Univ. Press.

Zheng, T. (2000). **Characteristics of Australian Political Language Rhetoric: Tactics of Gaining Public Support and Shrinking Responsibility**. School of Asian Language and Studies": University of Tasmania

أفعال الكلام وصيغ التأدب في خطابات النصر نيكسون وبوش في الانتخابات الرئاسية
الأمريكية: دراسة تداولية

الملخص:

تعنى هذه الدراسة بشكل أساسي بأفعال الكلام واستراتيجيات التأدب التي تظهر في خطاب النصر الرئاسي الأمريكي. تهدف الدراسة إلى إظهار قابلية تطبيق كل من تصنيف (Searle) لنظرية أفعال الكلام والتحقق في ثوابت (Leech) للتأدب التي ظهرت في هذا النوع عن طريق معرفة الترددات والنسبة المئوية لكلا النظريتين، ثم تحليل تباين هذه الأنواع بين العينات المختارة. يتبع البحث أسلوب تحليل مختلط إذ استعمل كل من الأساليب الكمية والنوعية. استنتج الباحث أن أربعة أشكال من أفعال (Searle) ظهرت في خطاب النصر الرئاسي الأمريكي. هذه الأفعال هي التوكيدية والتعبيرية والتوجيهية والتفاوضية. فضلاً عن ذلك أنه لم يستعمل أفعال الكلام البيانية أو التصريحية من قبل المرشحين المختارين. فيما يتعلق بنظرية التأدب، فقد وجد أن الاستحسان والتوافق لهما الظهور الأكثر تكراراً في هذا النوع مقارنة بالمبادئ الأخرى.