

Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies in Jessica Soho's Political Interviews: A Linguistic Analysis

Aimee Ann B. Sanglitan and Maria Luisa S. Saministrado, PhD

Xavier University - Ateneo de Cagayan, Philippines

Abstract: Much attention is given to politicians and the strategies that they use to be both cooperative and polite in the study of discourse and politics. Little attention is given to the important role that interviewers play in maintaining the conversation, and the strategies that they use not only on cooperation but also in politeness. This paper analyzes the way that Jessica Soho formulates her questions for political interviews. It also identifies the different politeness strategies she uses in order to maintain the conversation and arrive at preferred responses. Data was obtained through the transcript of five political interviews under the television program SONA of Jessica Soho, a well-known award-winning TV host. The results provided insights on political discourse and the role of politeness in political interviews.

Keywords: strategies, politeness, preferred responses, politics, political discourse, political interviews

I. INTRODUCTION

In the study of discourse and politics in general, and political interviews in particular, much interest is placed on politicians and their strategies to accomplish being polite and cooperative. According to studies by Bavelas, Black, Chovil, & Mullet (1990), politicians often use equivocation to deal successfully with conflict. The use of equivocation helps make their utterances 'ambiguous,' 'indirect,' and 'obscure' (Bull, 1998). Chilton and Schaffner suggest that equivocation is used in situations when "*the information necessary to answer the question is unavailable, the information is available but cannot be provided under, or if doing so would be inappropriate*" (Chilton & Schaffner, 1997). Politicians do this, especially during on-air interviews, to help maintain their positive face and an excellent public image. However, this hinders the interviewer from gaining the answers they need in the discussion. Often, the goals of the politician being interviewed and the interviewer are very different. The interviewer seeks to gain as much information as possible while the interviewee/politician aims to promote their public image. However, politicians and interviewers must have equal control over what counts as 'truthful,' 'relevant,' and 'sufficient' in the political discourse they participate in. Most studies on political interviews only focus on the linguistic activities and strategies of the politician but fail to examine the linguistic strategy of the reporter/interviewee, which is also crucial to the whole communicative discourse.

This paper filled the gap with its aim to examine the interviewer's use of linguistic strategies to arrive at preferred

responses. Specifically, it attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What strategies for positive and negative politeness were used by Jessica Sojo in her political interviews?
2. What are the most common strategies for positive and negative politeness?
3. Which strategies are constantly employed by the interviewer?
4. How effective are these strategies in eliciting the preferred response?

The leading theory used to support this study is Brown and Levinson's Politeness theory. Brown and Levinson (1987) start their discussion of the theory with the concept of the face, which they defined as something that can be maintained, enhanced, or lost in an interaction. They assert that the concept of face is emotionally invested and that people will generally try to preserve their face value and that of other peoples (Brown & Levinson, 1987). This assumption is supported by Eelen (2001) and Watts (2003), when they asserted that face and politeness are strategies used to avoid conflict and to support and maintain a cooperative social interaction (Viiki, 2006). Brown and Levinson further discuss the concept of the face by distinguishing between positive and negative face (1987). A positive face is interpreted as a person's desire to be accepted and appreciated. Positive facework often involves giving compliments and offering promises. On the other hand, a negative face is defined as the need of an individual to be autonomous from others and protect one's privacy (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

According to Wagner (n.d.), Brown and Levinson came up with the concept of politeness theory by studying how many speech acts can threaten participants' faces in interaction (Wagner, n.d.). These face-threatening acts (FTAs) have been described as threatening the positive or negative front of the speaker or the addressee (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Wagner, n.d.). Accepting compliments, apologies, confessions, and self-embarrassment or humiliation are all considered face-threatening acts against a speaker's positive face. While offering an apology, expressing gratitude, and making promises are face-threatening acts against the speaker's negative face. At the same time, FTAs against an addressee's negative face occurs when he is "pressured to accept or reject the future act" (Wagner, n.d.). On the other hand, FTAs against an addressee's positive face happen when a speaker

interrupts, criticizes or mentions a taboo topic in the interaction.

To address face-threatening acts, Brown and Levinson have developed positive and negative politeness strategies. Brown and Levinson assert that positive politeness is approach-based; and directed towards the hearer's positive self-image. The idea that the speaker and the hearer have the exact wants assures the hearer that the face-threatening act will be lessened. Negative politeness is avoidance-based as it satisfies the hearer's desire for autonomy. Negative politeness is accomplished when the speaker recognizes the hearer's want to maintain independence and performs speech acts that lessen the FTA towards the hearer's negative face (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Interaction must also be categorized as on-record or off-record before a speaker or addressee can correctly choose the appropriate way of dealing with the face-threatening act. In conversation, much communication is done by implying something rather than directly saying it. A statement is considered off-record when indirect or implied (Gunawan, n.d.). Brown and Levinson recommend being off-record when a speaker wants to be tactful and avoid possible face-threatening statements or interpretations. However, when a speaker wants to be frank, direct, and straightforward in addressing the hearer, he can choose to be on record (Gunawan, n.d.). Being on paper can either be bald on-record or with redress. Brown and Levinson recommend being on-record and positive politeness if the speaker wants to create a social context with the hearer and minimize the possible threat of the speech act. Being on-record and negative politeness is suggested if a speaker wants to maintain social distance or imply that he is considering the addressee's face wants (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Another framework applicable to this study is that of Ting-Toomey's analysis of face. Ting-Toomey defines face through a Chinese context; it is relational and situational (Ng, 1999). Some essential assumptions according to Ting-Toomey's framework are that: (1) the concept of face is negotiated upon by people of different cultural backgrounds; (2) the negotiation of the face involves positive- and negative-concerns and self-and other concerns; this shows that interactions have multiple goal orientations; (3) The concept of the face becomes problematic in instances where embarrassment, conflict, or awkward requests are made (Ng, 1999).

The PowerPoint Positive and Negative Politeness (n.d.) by the University of Hildesheim outline the positive and negative strategies which may be used to address face-threatening acts. Positive politeness may be divided into three categories, each with its strategy. The first category is claiming common ground. This is often done when the speaker claims a shared perspective or membership with the hearer or by conveying that a hearer's goal is also significant to the speaker. Strategies for this include noticing the condition of the hearer, exaggerating the speaker's tone and voice, intensifying

interest in the speaker, using in-group markers to highlight belonging, seeking agreement and avoiding disagreement, asserting common ground, and sharing jokes (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Positive & Negative Politeness, n.d.). The second category involves having the speaker and hearer appear to be cooperators in a relevant activity. Strategies for this category include asserting knowledge and concern for the face wants of the hearer by giving offers and promises, by being optimistic, by maintaining reciprocity, and by having both the speaker and hearer in the activity. Lastly, a speaker may opt to fulfill the face wants of the hearer to some degree (Positive & Negative Politeness, n.d. ; Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Negative politeness strategies include being indirect, using hedges, being pessimistic, minimizing imposition, giving deference, apologizing, being impersonal, stating the face-threatening act as a general rule, and normalizing (Positive & Negative Politeness, n.d. ; Brown & Levinson, 1987). All of these are done to be indirect and to give the hearer redress.

However, despite these strategies, it can be observed that politicians in political interviews still give vague answers. Levinson (1992) argues that political discussions are unlike regular everyday interactions in which people usually follow the rules for interaction. Beales et al. support this by stating that politicians find themselves in situations where their face wants are incompatible and even contrary to the problem in political interviews. However, they are still obliged to provide an answer. This results in equivocation (Beales, 1988, 2009). To effectively define equivocation, Beales et al. used Haley's 1959 model. This model asserts the four elements of communication: content, sender, receiver, context; equivocation occurs when any four details are presented vaguely and confusingly (Watzlawick, Beales, & Jackson, 1967). Beales argues that equivocation avoids direct communication and frees the politician from face-threatening acts and the possible consequences. This concept is succinctly summarized in the quote, "*the individual resorts to 'the gentle art of saying nothing by saying something...as the only possible reactions to an...untenable communication context'*" (Watzlawick, Beales, & Jackson, 1967). Self-contradictions, inconsistencies, subject switches, tangentialisations, incomplete sentences, and misunderstanding have been listed by Beales, et al. as strategies that politicians use to be able to equivocate during a political interview. These strategies are commonly observed in almost all political interviews, whether local or international" (Watzlawick, Beales, & Jackson, 1967).

II. RESEARCH METHOD

Since this paper aimed to fill the gap by examining the interviewer's use of linguistic strategies to arrive at preferred responses, the study employed a qualitative examination of political interviews. This paper used five political interviews with Filipino politicians who hold government office. The focus was on the politeness strategies employed by the interviewer, and the same interviewer performed all

interviews. This research paper chose the political interviews done by Jessica Sojo under her television program SONA with Jessica Sojo. The topics for each discussion revolved around the general issues concerning the politician being interviewed.

The data collection for this paper was done by watching five political interviews conducted by Jessica Sojo. After watching these interviews, the transcripts were obtained by transcribing them. The participants for these interviews were politicians who held government positions when the interview was conducted. It is to be noted that only parts of the interview

were included in this paper to ensure brevity and focus on the politeness strategies used by the interviewer.

III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Q1. What strategies for positive and negative politeness were used by Jessica Sojo in her political interviews?

This section analyzed and identified the questions for politicians based on the strategies for positive and negative politeness, as shown in the second column of the table for the transcripts below.

Table 1. Transcript of the questions and strategies of the interviewer for the first politician

Politician: Nancy Binay Issue: Credibility for Senatorial Race Bid and Political Dynasty	
QUESTIONS	STRATEGY USED: POSITIVE POLITENESS
1. "Hmm. Ano ba kasing sabi sa'yo, mas effective ba yung campaigning through motorcade, itong pagpunta sa mga rally kaysa to appear on national TV?"	1. Seek agreement (Positive Politeness)
2. "Ok, you're saying you have the experience sa politics because you've dealt, you've, you've dealt with all sorts of people as your parents assistant. Ganun ba yun, ganun ba yun Nancy? I heard somebody say na ikaw yung kumaka-usap sa mga lumalapit sa iyong mga magulang."	2. Fulfilling the hearer's Wants (Positive Politeness)
QUESTIONS	STRATEGY USED: NEGATIVE POLITENESS
3. "Ok Nancy, pasensya ka na ha? Pero kasi alam ko hindi ka yata nagbigay ng interview ever eh mula noong nag announce ka na tatakbo ka for senator. Ang mga batikos sa'yo, bakit ka raw biglang tumakbo as senator? You have nothing but your father's family name, etc. Ano ang masasagot mo sa ganitong binabatong criticism?"	3. Apologize (Negative Politeness), Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
4. "Pero ano yata, yung mga karamihan na mga forum sa TV, wala kang inoohan. Very rare kasi, tuloy nagkaroon ng perception na ayaw monh makipag-debate, matanong, mausisa, etc. etc."	4. Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
5. "Nancy, yung pinakamabigat na paratang or criticism sa iyo, wala ka naman daw credentials to speak of aside from having been the assistant to your parents in politics. Sabi pa nga noong isang hashtag, OJT si Nancy. Parang ganun na parang, ano ba ito, ano ba itong pagiging senator? Para siyang nag-oon the job training. Abe eh, national interest ang at stake pa gang isang tao ay tumakbo para sa isang national position. Ano ang maikakasagot mo diyan, Nancy?"	5. Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
6. "Pero bakit daw senador agad? Mayroong tanong na ganyan, bakit daw senador eh wala ka naman daw experience sa local politics man lang. ah, hindi ka, you haven't held government positions, biglang, ang bilis naman senadar na lang. Senador na agad, sorry."	6. Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
7. "Nancy, last question na lang. Ah, ang tatay mo vice president, ah and kapatid mo mayor ng Makati, yung is among kapatid ay ah, congresswoman ng Makati, iyong mother ay naging mayor din ng Makati, ikaw, you ran for the senate. Lahat na lang ba daw kayo nasa gobyerno? Isa daw kayong political dynasty?"	7. Impersonalize (Negative Politeness), Normalize (Negative Politeness)
8. "Ok, ah, Nancy, would you care to comment on the other criticisms they are hurling against you. Baka mayroon akong hindi natanong. You can address your critics and even maybe your supporters."	8. Minimize imposition (Negative Politeness)

Table 2. Transcript of the questions and strategies of the interviewer for the second politician

Politician: Rodrigo Duterte, former Davao City mayor and now president Issue: Extrajudicial killing and Presidential bid	
QUESTIONS	STRATEGY USED: POSITIVE POLITENESS
1. "Hmm. Akala ko ho ito na yung anunsyo niyo, eh tungkol sa 2016, kasi yun 'yo hong inaabangan. Yung huli po kayong nagsalita, may mga kontrobersyal ho daw kayong nasabi."	1. Intensify interest to hearer (Positive Politeness),
2. "Final answer niyo na ho ba yun? Na hindi kayo tatakbo sa 2016 kasi nasabi niyo na ho yan pero marami pa rin po ang nagtutulak sa inyo. How about for vice president?"	2. Seek agreement (Positive Politeness),
3. "So ayaw niyo ng any national government position?"	3. Seek agreement (Positive Politeness)
4. "Mayor, bakit ho ayaw niyo pong pag-usapan ngayon yung widely reported na mga binitawan niyong salita? I understand a few days ago tungkol ho ito sa mga nangyari sa Davao, yung anong mangyayari kung kayo ay tumakbong presidente. Accurate ho ba yung mga lumabas ho na sinabi niyo di umano?"	4. Ask for reasons (Positive Politeness), Seek agreement (Positive Politeness)
5. "Mayor, hindi niyo po totoong sinabi na pagka huwag kayong gawing presidente, dahil pagka kayo'y naging presidente, eh yung sinasabing bilang ng pinatay niyo sa Davao, eh baka maging 100,000 at tataba yung mga isda sa Manila bay. Wala ho kayong ganung statement na binitawan mayor?"	5. Avoid disagreement (Positive Politeness)
QUESTIONS	STRATEGY USED: NEGATIVE POLITENESS
6. "Ok, ok. Sorry ho mayor, kasi may lumabas po na letrato kanina ni Sec. Mar Roxas at kayo, at parang nag-uusap po kayo, at sabi ho yata ng Liberal Party ay hinihingi rin po kayong maging katambal ni Roxas."	6. Apologizing (Negative Politeness), Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
7. "Oho. Eh, ano pong reaction niyo mayor doon sa pagsasabing you are a, you are, parang, kontrang-kontra kayo sa democracy or democratization process ng Pilipinas at abogado pa naman ho kayo. Eh bakit parang kayo na, sa inyo ng kamay ang lahat ng batas pati na yung pag-punish sa mga abusado? Ano hong reaction niyo diyan mayor?"	7. Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
8. "Hmm. Akala ko ho ito na yung anunsyo niyo, eh tungkol sa 2016, kasi yun 'yo hong inaabangan. Yung huli po kayong nagsalita, may mga kontrobersyal ho daw kayong nasabi."	8. Impersonalize (Negative politeness)
9. "Final answer niyo na ho ba yun? Na hindi kayo tatakbo sa 2016 kasi nasabi niyo na ho yan pero marami pa rin po ang nagtutulak sa inyo. How about for vice president?"	9. Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)

Table 3. Transcript of the questions and strategies of the interviewer for the third politician

Politician: Ferdinand Marcos Jr., senator and now presidential candidate Issue: Human Rights Abuses and corruption during the Marcos Administration	
QUESTIONS	STRATEGY USED: POSITIVE POLITENESS
1. "So you don't lose sleep, you don't worry, hindi kayo na-aalala na kung ano ang magiging place in history ng pangalan ng inyong angkan o nang inong pamilya?"	1. Exaggerate (Positive Politeness)
2. "Robert Swift said na sana raw dahil nasa senador na kayo, you should work for a final settlement."	2. Give/Ask for reasons (Positive Politeness)
QUESTIONS	STRATEGY USED: NEGATIVE POLITENESS
3. "Senator, ang nanay niyo ay congresswoman, ang kapatid niyo ay governor, kayo po ay senador. Marami pihado nagtatanong, ano bang agenda ulit ng mga Marcos?"	3. Normalize (Negative Politeness)
4. "Mission niyo po bang pabanguhin ang pangalan nang inyong pamilya?"	4. Normalize (Negative Politeness)
5. "Senator, pasensya na, but I'll just pick up the keyword that you mentioned 'propaganda'. But then martial law victims are now being paid \$1000 or P43,000 and to them it's not the amount of money, to them it's an acknowledgement that there was something wrong done to them during the regime of your dad."	5. Apologize (Negative Politeness)

6. "But there are also other court cases, there are frozen accounts. Lahat po yun, hindi po yun propaganda. Those are real."	6. Question or Hedge (Negative Politeness)
7. "How do you explain the staggering amount of money sinasabi nila, eh yaman ninyo."	7. Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
8. "Senator, clarification lang po. Dati pag tinatanong kayo sa human rights violations, at some point you said 'I don't know how to answer that question', but you reportedly told the New York Times, let me just quote from there, 'there may have been abuses but they were never part of the policy of my father's administration.' So parang how do you reconcile the two? Now you're acknowledging that nagkaroon ng human rights violation."	8. Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
9. "Ang sabi niyo ho kung hindi umalis ang iyong ama, sana naging Singapore na tayo. Pero sabi ni Noynoy kung hindi umalis si Marcos baka naging Libya na ang Pilipinas."	9. Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
10. "So ayaw niyong sagutin si Pnoy na Libya na daw tayo kung hindi umalis si Marcos"	10. Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
11. "Now you want your father to be buried at the Libingan ng mga Bayani. But yung nanay po ng presidente ngayon, former Pres. Cory Aquino refused. Ayaw niyang ilibing sa Libingan ng mga Bayani si Marcos. Anong prospects niyo ngayon na anak na niya ang namumuno?"	11. Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
12. "Last question, at medyo personal, mahirap bang maging Marcos Senator Marcos?"	12. Minimize the imposition (Negative Politeness)

Table 4. Transcript of the questions and strategies of the interviewer for the fourth politician

Politician: Loren Legarda Issue: Inconsistency of senatorial polls	
QUESTIONS	STRATEGY USED : POSITIVE POLITENESS
1. "Loren, what happened? Kasi all the while people thought na ikaw yung no.1. Like mga dati mong, ah, sinalihang mong mga senatorial race. Ikaw yung onisistent na no.1 but this time and even the survey shortly before he elections, ikaw yung no.1 in both Pulse Asia and SWS. Biglang iba yung resulta. What do you think happened? Anong reaction mo doon?"	1. Exaggerate (Positive Politeness)
2. "But did you expect that she will overtake you? And even Chi and Alan Peter Cayetano?"	2. Notice, attend to the hearer (Positive Politeness)
3. "But I know you to be an overachiever, in school, in your academics, and ah, even, you know, in the other things that you do. You always strive to be the best. Yes, and the no.1. But this time, hindi mo nakuha, whatever it is, ah, diba, you know, it's just a number pero..."	3. Intensify interest to the hearer (Positive Politeness)
4. "Do you think nakasakit sa'yo yung mga you know, the last stretch of the campaign, eh may mga lumabas na paninira at black propaganda against you. Nakaapekto ba iyon sa iyong, you know, it affected your ranking?"	4. Intensify interest to the hearer (Positive Politeness)
QUESTIONS	STRATEGY USED : NEGATIVE POLITENESS
5. "But surely diba, well that's one way to look at it diba, a poetic way to look at it. Pero syempre there's also the scientific way to look at it and I'm sure yung staff mo na nag-strategize for you, I'm sure they're all scratching their heads now. What do you think went wrong, bakit hindi mo nakuha yung top position?"	5. Be Pessimistic (Negative Politeness)
6. "Ok. Itong pagsali mo sa Team Pnoy, for this elections, ah, hanggang saan ba ang loyalty and commitment mo? I know they say na kung ilan ang bilang ng mga senador sa senado, ganyan din ang bilang ng independent republics. You can't really expect our senators to consistently tow the partyline."	6. Joking (Positive Politeness), Pessimism (Negative Politeness)

Table 5. Transcript of the questions and strategies of the interviewer for the fifth politician

Politician: Alfredo Lim, former Manila Mayor Issue: Corruption during his term and Illegal building permit	
QUESTIONS	STRATEGY USED : POSITIVE POLITENESS
1. "Sabi po, may ordinansya ang Manila dating back to 2007 na nagse-set po ng limit sa lahat ng mga building malapit sa, monu, monumento ni Rizal na up to 7 floors lamang. Pero, ah, sa inyo pong administrasyon daw eh, umabot nga to ah, 7 floors ho ba? Oh, umakyat pa ho sabi nga daw po ni Mayor Estrada, eh nung pag-upo niya eh by 7 floors na ho daw nakatayo, eh paano po ba nangyari ito Mayor?"	1.Intensify interest to the hearer (Positive Politeness),
2. "I understand at that time, that early, Mayor eh meron na nong nagpo-protesta na iyong building na yun, may epekto to doon sa monument ni Rizal. Pero, ah, sa pagkakasabi po ditto sa research na nakuha naming, eh hindi gaanong naintindi yung mga nagprotesta noon dahil papa-eleksyon na po daw noon. Nalaman niyo ho ba yung mga nagpo-protesta, yung noon pa, sa inyong termino Mayor?"	2. Intensify interest to the hearer (Positive Politeness),
3. "Looking back Mayor, anong dapat natin gawin pala sa ganito hong mga, ah, monumento no, eh, kung nandito ka naman eh, makikita mo sa matter of perspective lang ho ba yan? Eh, papaano kaya nag, how do we get out of this controversy Mayor?"	3.Seek agreement (Positive Politeness)
QUESTIONS	STRATEGY USED : NEGATIVE POLITENESS
4. "Sabi po, may ordinansya ang Manila dating back to 2007 na nagse-set po ng limit sa lahat ng mga building malapit sa, monu, monumento ni Rizal na up to 7 floors lamang. Pero, ah, sa inyo pong administrasyon daw eh, umabot nga to ah, 7 floors ho ba? Oh, umakyat pa ho sabi nga daw po ni Mayor Estrada, eh nung pag-upo niya eh by 7 floors na ho daw nakatayo, eh paano po ba nangyari ito Mayor?"	4..Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
5. "Oho, pero sabi po ni Mayor Estrada, may dokumento raw na nagpapakita po na ang aprobado niyo raw ho ay hanggang 49 floors."	5.Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
6. "I understand at that time, that early, Mayor eh meron na nong nagpo-protesta na iyong building na yun, may epekto to doon sa monument ni Rizal. Pero, ah, sa pagkakasabi po ditto sa research na nakuha naming, eh hindi gaanong naintindi yung mga nagprotesta noon dahil papa-eleksyon na po daw noon. Nalaman niyo ho ba yung mga nagpo-protesta, yung noon pa, sa inyong termino Mayor?"	6.Impersonalize (Negative Politeness)
7. "Ooh, so at that time po Mayor, inaral niyo na po rin pala ito, na pagka-doon ka nagpalitrato eh, ok naman, may mga ganyan na po kayong pagsusuri pagtitiyak noon pa man."	7. Question, Hedge (Negative Politeness)

The positive and negative strategies used by Jessica Sojo are the following: Under positive politeness, these are claiming common ground, conveying that the hearer and speaker are cooperators, and fulfilling the hearer's wants. Specifically, under claiming common ground, the interviewer notices and attends to the speaker, exaggerates, intensifies interest to the hearer, seeks agreement by raising safe topics by repeating part or all of what the previous speaker has said, avoids

disagreement through the token of agreement, pseudo-agreement, white lies, or hedging opinions, and joking. Under conveying that the hearer and speaker are cooperators, the interviewer asks for or gives reasons.

For negative politeness, the interviewer questions or hedges the interviewee, minimizes the imposition, apologizes, impersonalizes the speaker and the hearer, normalizes, and is being pessimistic with the interviewee's answer.

Table 6 summarizes the positive and negative strategies used by the interviewer.

1. POSITIVE POLITENESS	A. Claim Common ground <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notice, attend to speaker 2. Exaggerate 3. Intensify interest to the hearer 4. Seek agreement by raising safe topics or repeating part or all of what the previous speaker has said. 5. Avoid disagreement through token of agreement, pseudo-agreement, white lies or hedging opinions. 6. joking
	B. Convey that the hearer and speaker are cooperators by giving or asking for reasons.
	C. Fulfill the hearer's wants
2. NEGATIVE POLITENES	A. Questions or hedges B. Being pessimistic C. Minimize the imposition D. Apologize E. Impersonalize the speaker and the hearer F. Normalize

Q2: What are the most common strategies for positive and negative politeness?

There are mainly three categories for a speaker-interviewer to address the hearer's positive face. These are to claim common ground, convey that the speaker and the hearer are co-operators, and fulfill the hearer's wants. Under the first category, Jessica Sojo uses six strategies. The speaker may convey that some want of the hearer is admirable and interesting to the speaker too. He can (1) notice, attend to the hearer. The speaker should take note of aspects of the hearer's condition - noticeable changes, unique possessions, anything which the hearer might want the speaker to see and acknowledge. Jessica Sojo exhibits this strategy during her interview with Loren Legarda by first explaining Legarda's current standing for the senatorial race and then asking her what she thinks and how she feels about it. (2) Exaggerate, whether in tone or word stress. During her interview with Sen. Bongbong Marcos, Jessica Sojo used exaggeration to raise her question on the status of the Marcos family. (3) Intensify interest to the hearer. The speaker intensifies the interest in his contribution by "making a good story" and drawing the hearer as a participant with direct questions. In her interview with Davao Mayor Rodrigo Duterte, Jessica Sojo first states opinions regarding Duterte's alleged candidacy for president before asking him a declarative question. (4) Seek agreement, where the speaker looks for ways in which it is possible to agree with the hearer. Jessica Sojo used this strategy during her interview with Nancy Binay. She raises a 'safe topic' to satisfy Nancy's desire to be correct regarding her campaign strategy. (5) Avoid disagreement, where the speaker uses pseudo-agreement, white lies, or hedges to hide disagreement in response to a previous response. In her fourth question with Mayor Duterte, Jessica Sojo expresses pseudo-agreement when she says "Mayor, hindi niyo po tootong sinabi na..." by

the way she expresses/delivers her question. (6) Joking, as jokes are based on mutual shared background and values.

During her interview with Loren Legarda, Sojo uses this strategy when she jokes about politicians towing the party-list line. For the second category, she uses only one approach, which is to give/ask for reasons. She uses this when she asks Mayor Duterte regarding his controversial statements and his alleged presidential candidacy. For negative politeness, she also uses six strategies, namely: question or hedge, be pessimistic, minimize the imposition, apologize, impersonalize the speaker and the hearer, normalize. (1) Questions or edges are used when the speaker does not want to presume or coerce the hearer. Hedges modify the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase to be valid only to a certain degree. (2) Pessimism is used when the speaker wants to redress the hearer's negative face by explicitly expressing doubt that the conditions for the appropriateness of the speaker's speech act. (3) Minimizing imposition is done by defusing the face-threatening act, indicating that the intrinsic seriousness of the imposition is not great. Here only social distance and power are considered as factors. (4) Apologizing is used when (5) Impersonalizing is done through phrasing the FTA as if the agent were other than the speaker and the addressee were other than the speaker. (6) Normalizing is used when the speaker dissociates himself from the statement and focuses on the hearer.

Q3: Which of the strategies are constantly employed by the interviewer?

The most commonly used strategies for positive politeness are to intensify interest to the hearer and avoid disagreement, and for negative politeness, the most frequently used strategies are impersonalizing, apologizing, and normalizing. Strengthening appeal to the hearer, often by making a good story and

creating a narrative that is easy to follow, allows the hearer to relax and possibly lessen their consciousness of the interview and what they have to say. This may also be why Jessica Soho tries her best not to seem too argumentative to her interviewees. She may use her experience as a reporter to draw the politician being interviewed and the viewer into the world of the interview. To bridge the first strategy to the second, she needs to continue lessening the amount of face-threatening acts present in the communicative activity. She also needs to ensure that the interviewees remain cooperative and provide satisfying answers. By avoiding disagreement, she also shows her interviewees that she is aware of their facial wants and the public image they have to maintain.

Q4: How effective are these strategies in eliciting the preferred response?

It has been observed that the interviewer uses both positive and negative strategies to get her preferred response. Sometimes, she uses both methods in one question. Despite the speaker's effort, communication is often a two-way process that requires the cooperation of the sender and receiver. However, this does not stop the interviewee/politician from avoiding the question or using equivocation whenever they feel that the question is threatening to his face or that answering the question would not be appropriate for the current circumstances. This is observable, especially during the former Mayor Lim and former President Estrada's interviews. In political discussions, the over use of equivocation signals to the interviewer and the viewer that the politician is refusing to speak clearly about something that is considered relevant.

IV. CONCLUSION

Politics is an exciting field to apply the theory of face and politeness because both interviewer and interviewee have clear goals that the viewer can observe during political interviews. No matter how much an interviewer pushes for preferred answers, politicians have strategies that they can use to avoid losing face and maintain their public images. This paper attempted to fill the gaps by examining the interviewer's linguistic strategy to arrive at preferred responses. By seeing how both sides use strategies to save face and at the same time co-operate in the communicative activity, viewers learn how complicated a simple conversation can be and how to better listen to discussions so that the nuances do not escape the listener. This study's strategies and other insights on conversation are applicable in formal talks and daily conversations. This paper could help its readers make better political choices by critically observing certain politicians and how truthful or diplomatic they present themselves.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper is anchored on the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson. More varied research and related studies might yield even more strategies observed in political interviews. Also, since only one interviewer was observed, an alternative

study is proposed to monitor one politician being interviewed by different reporters to determine how much a politician uses equivocation in a political interview and how other reporters use varied strategies to address equivocation.

REFERENCES

- [1] "Positive and negative politeness, the concept of "face" and FTAs". (n.d.) University of Hildesheim. [PowerPoint Slides]. Retrieved from http://www.uni-hildesheim.de/~beneke/WS04-05/Referate_Hoeflichkeit/politeness.ppt.
- [2] Bavelas, J. B., Black, A., Bryson, L., & Mullett, J. (1988). Political equivocation: A situational explanation. Retrieved from <http://web.uvic.ca/psyc/bavelas/1988politic.pdf>
- [3] Bavelas, J.B. (2009). Equivocation. In H.T. Reis & S. Sprecher (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Human Relationships*, Vol. 1 (pp.537-539). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sae. Retrieved from <http://web.uvic.ca/psyc/bavelas/2009Equivocation.pdf>
- [4] Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universal in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_64421/component/file2225570/content
- [5] Bull, P. (1998). Equivocation theory and news interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 17(1), 36-51. Retrieved from [https://pure.york.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/equivocation-theory-and-news-interviews\(f992018b-47a6-4b50-bf84-10b1411068d2\)/export.html](https://pure.york.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/equivocation-theory-and-news-interviews(f992018b-47a6-4b50-bf84-10b1411068d2)/export.html)
- [6] Clayman, S., & Heritage, J. (2002). *The news interview*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (1997) "Discourse and Politics". *Discourse as Social in Interaction*. London: Sage, 1997, pp. 206-230.
- [8] Eelen, Gino (2001). "A Critique of Politeness Theories." Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- [9] Gunawan, Indra. (n.d). *Politeness*. [PowerPoint Slides] Retrieved from <http://www.slideshare.net/indralovemaisha/pragmatic-politeness>
- [10] Karsberg, H. (2012) "Politeness Strategies: A Theoretical Framework". Sweden: University of Gavle School of Education and Finance. <http://hig.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:565250/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- [11] Li, Songqing. (2008). "A Performative Perspective of Flouting and Politeness in Political Interview". Singapore: National University of Singapore. Retrieved from http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL12/pdf_doc/3.pdf
- [12] Ng, J. (1999). *The Four Faces of Face*. Mediate. Retrieved from https://www.mediate.com/articles/the_four_faces_of_face.cfm
- [13] Vilkki, L. (n.d.). "Politeness, Face and Facework: Current Issues". University of Helsinki. Retrieved from http://www.linguistics.fi/julkaisut/SKY2006_1/1.4.7.%20VILKKI.pdf
- [14] S. Ting-Toomey, "Intercultural Conflict Styles: A Face Negotiation Theory: in *Theories in Intercultural Communication* (Y.Y. Kim and W.B. Gudykunst, Eds.) (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1988) p 213-235
- [15] Watzlawick, P., Beavin Bavales, J. & Jackson, D.D. (1967). *Pragmatics of human communication: A study of interactional patterns, pathologies, and paradoxes*. New York: W.W. Norton retrieved from <http://web.uvic.ca/psyc/bavelas/1988politic.pdf>
- [16] Watts, Richard J. (2003) *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Wagner, Lisa. "Positive- and Negative-Politeness Strategies: Apologizing in the Speech Community of Cuernavaca, Mexico". United States: University of Louisville, (n.d.). retrieved from <http://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/02-Lisa-C.-Wagner.pdf>