# CHAPTER IV

# FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of the research which are then analyzed by using the theory that has been reviewed in chapter 2. The findings in this research are the debaters' utterances which contain Face threatening acts and also politeness strategies which are performed by the debaters in order to soften the face threatening acts. These findings in this research has answered the research questions, they are face threatening acts and also politeness strategies which are performed by the debaters.

## A. Findings

This chapter consists of two parts. The first part describes the findings for the face threatening acts commonly performed by the debaters. The second part describes politeness strategies performed by the debaters to soften the face threatening acts. Those findings are gotten from debate.org forum debate online.

From the object of the research, the researcher has chosen ten topics of the debate from debate.org, they are : Does age matter on this website?, The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking, There are no contradictions in the Bible, The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy, Democracy is not the Best Form of

Government, If you imaigne it to get the answer you might aswell imagine the opposite, Is Imperialism Good for the United States?, Should america accept muslims people?, Allowing Refugees from Syria is an all around bad idea, Is Drug Control Unconstitutional?. From those debate topics, the researcher then searches any arguments containing face threatening act and politeness strategies. The researcher has found 88 as required which 13 data contain politeness strategies and 85 data contain face threatening acts. Those data are analyzed by using Brown and Levinson Theory of Politeness Strategy.

1. **Face Threatening Acts commonly performed by the debaters**

   This study reveals that there are 15 Face Threatening Acts commonly performed by the debaters from 85 data: Threat/ warning, Agreeing, Expressing thanks, Accusing, Insulting, Disagreeing, Imposing, Suggesting, Self humiliating, Apologizing, Complimenting, Ordering, Asking to stop doing activity, Criticizing, and Annoying. Those 85 data are gotten from the data contain face threatening acts itself and also face threatening acts which are softened by some mitigating devices. Below are the analyses of those findings of face threatening acts which commonly performed by the debaters. These are only some analysis from the whole analyses which have been found by the researcher.

a. Threat/ warning

These three data include in Threat/warning acts. These three data are only the sample data from 5 data which are found. Below are the analyses and descriptions.

Datum 1

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 01/01/Con (against) Themeaman909 (T909)/Does age matter on this website? | 1 | **First round is acceptance only, or you automatically forfeit.** Forfeiting ONE round of debating results in an automatic loss to the side that forfeited. |
| 01/01/Pro (for) fire_wings (FW)/Does age matter on this website? | 2 | I accept arguments in the next round. |

Analysis:

This statement is delivered in the first beginning of the debate where con position argued first. He/she made the rule that in the first round is only for acceptance and if the addressee doesn't follow the rule so pro side of the house will be automatically forfeit.

The act of threat or warning in datum 1 is written in bold utterance. In that sentence is clearly seen that the addresser's statement has threatened addressee's negative

face to be free from imposition by giving the rule that the first round is only for acceptance which must be obeyed by the opponent. The addresser has also given the threatening act that is when the addresser doesn't obey the rule so he/she will be automatically forfeit. It means this rule has forced the addressee to obey the rule which the addressee may doesn't want to do it. The addressee is perforce because the addresser gives threat to the addressee when the opponent doesn't obey the rule so he/she will be automatically forfeit.

Datum 2

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 06/01/Pro (for) vi-_spex/If you imagine it to get answer, you might as well imagine the opposite | 11 | For sure |
| 06/01/Con (against) BlazingRodent/If you imagine it to get answer, you might as well imagine the opposite | 12 | So, the resolution states that "*if you imaigne it to get the answer, you might aswell imagine the opposite*"<br><br>**For my arguments, I will be using an example to prove my opponent wrong**. But before I use my example, let me point out that the resolution is incoherent due to the sub par grammar that is taking place and the lack of a connection |

between….

Analysis:

This debate is begun by con side of the house by giving no more arguments which then pro side of the house delivers his/her arguments to begin the debate as stated above.

The act of threat or warning in datum 2 is written in bold utterance, in that utterance the addresser has threatened opponent's negative face to have the desire to go about his/her business freely and without being impeded by others. But here the addressee gives warning or threatening act by stating that his/her arguments will prove the addressee is in the wrong arguments or position instead the addressee doesn't give arguments yet in the first beginning. The addressee may feel uncomfortable or feel afraid after the addresser said that she/he will prove the opponent is wrong.

Datum 3

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 08/01/ Con (against) stephannoi/ Should america accept muslims people ? | 15 | **Hi dilara i challenge you to my new debate topic**.In my opinion ,american should not accept muslim race because they can cause trouble to their society.I remember happen in 9/11 tragedy which |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | schock the nation as whole. Muslim people should pratice their religion and ethinics but not in our country.We don't have a place for extremist to live. |
| 08/01/ Pro (for) Dilara/ Should america accept muslims people ? | 16 | You are basically saying that all Muslims are extremists, which is not true. I agree that extremist Muslims should not be allowed in to America. But peaceful secular Muslims should. There are lots of good Muslims who are working against extremist Islam. Muslim …….. |

Analysis:

This debate is begun by con side of the house by giving a challenge to his/her opponent. He/she give challenge to Dilara about his/her new topic to be debated. The act of threat or warning in datum 3 is written in bold utterance. In that bold utterance shows us that the addresser has threatened addressee's negative face to be free from imposition and do his/her business without being impeded by others. Challenge may make the addressee doesn't feel free and she/he may feel

uncomfortable because addressee have to force him/her to follow the challenge because it is in a debate case. It is very impossible for the addressee to refuse this because refuse means accepting a shellacking.

b. Agreeing

These three data include in Agreeing. These three data are just the sample data from 7 data which are found. Below are the analyses and the descriptions

Datum 4

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 02/01/ Con (against) moneystacker/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 3 | First round is simply for acceptance.<br>I will now state some information to intrinsically clarify the round.<br>Reason why this topic: I had this topic for a debate in congress and a lot of people actually believed in this. Also a friend yesterday told me how this would work so I am curious to hear more on it.<br>Definition: Drinking=of or relating to the act of drinking of alcohol |
| 02/01/ Pro (for) pimpmaster/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more | 4 | **I accept this debate.**<br>I am not 100% infavor of 13, but I do agree that 21 is too old in the US for a |

| | |
|---|---|
| responisible drinking | legal drink. So I would like to debate this subject. If my opponent would accept I would like to argue on 18 or no age restrictions, however, I am not against …….. |

Analysis:

This debate is opened by con side of the house. Con side of the house gave some rules on how the debate will run in that round. Then it is answered by pro side of the house that she/he accepts the debate or other means he/she accepts the rules which are proposed by the addresser before giving more detail arguments/rebuttals. So that is way it includes in agreeing face threatening acts.

The act of agreeing in datum 4 is written in bold utterance. This utterance has threatened addresser's positive face by accepting addressee's rules which are proposed by the addressee. Accepting means agreeing about the rule and acknowledging other's good idea or superiority and it can damage addressee's positive face. Because basically everyone has the desire that she/he is the only one who has superiority.

Datum 5

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 07/01/ Pro (for) UlyssesWake/ Is Imperialism Good for the United States? | 13 | Round One is for a short premise explaining why you have taken position on this topic and for details regarding your position.<br>Rules of Debate<br>• Take the debate seriously……. |
| 07/01/ Con (against) TheFlyingPham/ Is Imperialism Good for the United States? | 14 | **I accept this debate, because America isn't a perfect country,** and what gives us the right to force our way of living on other people? You can't be an a country that has commited …….. |

Analysis:

This is the second data which shows us an agreeing face threatening act which can damage addresser's positive face. This statement is also delivered in the first round by pro side of the house where the debate is actually begun by con side of the house by proposing some rules and some arguments. Then the addresser accepted the rules proposed by the addressee. The act of agreeing in datum 5 is written in bold utterance Here the addresser has

threatened her/his positive face by accepting the debate's rule which can lead the debate will go through. This agreeing can include in agreeing face threatening act because it means the addresser has acknowledged addressee's good idea or arguments. Because basically everyone has the desire that she/he is the only one who has superiority.

Datum 6

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 09/02/ Pro (for) kingcripple/ Allowing Refugees from Syria is an all around bad idea | 17 | …… Finally, Must we forget about Paris and my home town of San Bernardino? [4][5] At least in the case of the San Bernardino tragedy, we know the shooters were radicalized before coming to America.<br><br>I ask again, is this a something we want to risk with the refugees, with no vetting process?..... |
| 09/02/ Con (against) 2cents4change / Allowing Refugees from Syria is an all around bad idea | 18 | It appears that much of your argument is basis on a fear of ' why take the risk 'attitude**. I agree that majority of TERROR INCLINED RADICALIZED** Muslims want to impose Sharia Law on |

all other races and religions …….

Analysis:

This is the last sample data of agreeing face threatening act. This arguments was delivered when it was in second round where the debate still in the beginning. The debate was opened by the pro and has rebutted by the con side of the house in the first round. In the second round the pro side of the house gave more detail arguments and also rebuttal towards the opponent in the first round. Seems the pro has succeeded in giving rebuttal to the con's arguments till she/he finally agreed to the pro's arguments that majority of Terror Inclined Radicalized.

The act of agreeing in 6 is written in bold utterance. In that bold utterance the addresser has threatened his/her positive face. By agreeing opponent's argument which means addresser has acknowledged the opponent's better idea, the opponent's ability in giving stronger and better arguments while his/her own arguments are weaker and can be rebutted by his/her opponent's arguments. We have to remember that everyone has the desire to be well thought of and be admired by others. So here, the addresser has threatened his/her positive face to be admired that his/her arguments are stronger and better but in fact his/her own arguments are weaker and can be rebutted by the opponent.

c. Expressing thanks

These are the whole data about expressing thanks face threatening act which have been found by the researcher. Below are the analyses and the descriptions.

Datum 7

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 01/02/ Con (against) Themeaman909 (T909)/Does age matter on this website? | 1 | I would first like to give my general reason for choosing con, stereotypes.<br>1)"Sociology. a simplified and standardized conception or image invested with special meaning and held in common by members of a group." ( http://dictionary.reference.com ... )……. |
| 01/02/ Pro (for) fire_wings (FW)/Does age matter on this website? | 2 | **I thank my opponent for his arguments**.<br>**Framework**<br>I thank my opponent for this debate. However this debate is a truism, making me have to win this debate, because it is a truism. BoP is shared.<br>Arguments<br>1. Birthday matters<br>[1] Sign out, and click sign up in the DDO page. There is names, usernames, passwords, and your birthday. It says why is this needed?<br>*" Providing your birthday will help us ensure you receive the best Debate.org experience for your age……..* |

Analysis:

This statement is stated by the addresser in the second round where the debate has run once in the first round and it is continued here. The addressee has given long arguments towards his/her position before. Till in this second round the addresser felt that his/her opponent's previous arguments support addresser's position to be the winner instead. By expressing thanks to the addressee, it means that the addresser has acknowledged addressee's good deed.

The act of expressing thank in datum 7 is written in bold utterance. This utterance is included in face threatening act because by acknowledging opponent's good deed it can damage addresser's negative face because basically everyone wants to be free from imposition. In this case, by expressing thank it means the addresser's has forced him/her to express thank where actually everyone doesn't want to acknowledge other's good deed or better idea. Because everyone wants he/she is the only one who has superiority and doesn't want there is someone who is better than her/him.

Datum 8

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 04/01/ Pro (for) CircularLogic/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the | 7 | …….**I would like to thank my opponent in advance for accepting this debate,** and as a disclaimer I do like to go into a fair amount of detail in my arguments and would appreciate someone who has |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Star Wars original trilogy | | the time to put the same depth into their own statements.<br>Opening statements<br>Characters: In general, the characters of the prequel trilogy are very plastic, and uninteresting, when compared to the original trilogy. ……. |
| 04/01/ Con (against) TheRealGod/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 8 | My opening statement is going to start off with the plot.<br>Plot: George Lucas wanted to tell a different story In a different. The main difference was the ERA the prequels started out in a time of peace while the original ……. |

Analysis:

This debate is actually opened by pro side of the house by proposing some arguments and also some rules on how the debate will run. In this first round, after the addresser gave some rules, he/she expressed thank to the addressee where actually the addressee didn't do it yet. But it seems doesn't matter whether the addressee has done it or not, the addresser is pessimistic that the addressee will follow the rules. So the addresser gave thank to the addressee.

The act of expressing thank in datum 8 is written in bold utterance. This utterance in bold utterance can be included in face threatening act that is expressing thank. Expressing thanks can be found again in this data in the same

case as explained just now in the previous one. The addresser has threatened his/her own positive face by expressing thanks to his/her opponent's good deed by accepting the rules which have been delivered by the pro side of the house, it means the addresser here force him/herself to appreciate the opponent by giving thanks instead basically the addresser may feel constrained to acknowledge his/her addressee's good deed. Again, expressing thanks threatens an addresser's negative face since the addresser feel constrained to acknowledge his addressee's good deed.

Datum 9

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 04/03/ Con (against) TheRealGod/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 8 | …..Closing: just because there is no relatability to the protagonist does not make it an inferior movie. The nostalgia goggles, and the fact it was completely different from the original trilogy is what blinded people from the diamond in the rough…… |
| 04/04/ Pro (for) CircularLogic/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 7 | ……**I would like to thank my opponent for reading through my arguments,** and for the clear amount of hard work he put into his own. This has been a very entertaining debate and i look forward to my opponent's last statements and the results! |

Analysis:

This statement is delivered by pro side of the house when the debate has been in the last round where pro side of the house become the last speaker who delivered his/her arguments. Here is the last debate in this motion, so pro side of the house tried to close the debate by expressing thanks to the addressee because he/she has read through addresser's arguments in the first, second, third and also fourth round.

The act of agreeing in datum 9 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser has threatened his/her negative face to be free from imposition by forcing him/her to express thank to the addressee. As explained in the previous sample, basically everyone wants he/she is the only one who has superiority and doesn't want there is someone who is better than her/him. So, when the addresser has to acknowledge other good deed means that it is contrary his/her desire and she/he must force him/her to express thank which then threaten his/her negative face to be free from imposition.

d. Accusing

These below analyses and descriptions are the sample data of accusing face threatening acts from the six data which have been found by the researcher.

Datum 10

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 01/02/ Pro (for) fire_wings (FW)/Does age matter on this website? | 2 | …….All other private information submitted by the user is confidential and will not be disclosed except as required by law or to protect members of Debate.org. Most private information can be updated by the user at any time. Except where you are expressly informed otherwise, we do not sell, rent, share, trade or give away any of your personal information unless required by law or for the protection of your membership."…… |
| 01/03/ Con (against) Themeaman909 (T909)/Does age matter on this website? | 1 | **The first question I will ask you is if you read my argument effectively. I think you are only focusing on the site-to-user relationship, and that is possibly a truism.** I created this debate and specified in my argument that this debate topic concerns the relationship between debaters/users of the site, and does not utilize the sites interference or actions. I might have needed to be more specific in the topic, but I try to keep my topics somewhat general, so debaters can use a more creative approach. Now.... |

Analysis:

This statement is stated in the middle of the debate where the debate was still on fire because this debate is claimed truism by con side of the house where actually pro

side of the house disagree with it because his/her position will be in danger.

The act of accusing in datum 10 is written in bold utterance. That utterance includes in accusing face threatening act because the addresser accused the addressee that the addressee only focus on the site – to – user relationship which can bring the debate become truism. Here the addresser has threatened addressee's positive face. Everyone has the desire to be admired and always in right position. The act of accusing will bring the addressee to the wrong position. This act also can underestimate the addressee's capability because he/she is unable to move him/her from truism debate so it brings the addressee in the wrong position.

Datum 11

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 02/02/ Pro (for) pimpmaster/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 4 | ……My opponent feels the US population is unable to handle drinking at a younger age. However for his specific point offers nothing but an opinion. The truth is underage drinking occurs regardless of the legality. My opponents assertion is that the legality prevents adolescents from obtaining alcohol, however his own round 2 discussion disqualifies is own assertion ….. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 02/03/ Con (against) moneystacker/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 3 | …. I decided since he provided an opinion based off topic argument I would simply provide a layout of my argument.<br>I win the round anyway<br>**He claims his Case he provided in round 2 is for both 13 year olds and 18 year olds but its specific to 18 year old drinking thus his case falls since he doesn't prove the resolution. Round 2 is for stating your case and his case didn't prove the resolution thus I win the debate anyway**……. |

Analysis:

This statement came when the debate has been the third round. This debate debated about the age limitation of drinking in USA. Con's proposal proposed the age limitation of drinking in USA is 18 years old. In that case, con side of the house was giving the rebuttal to the opponent by giving act of accusing. He/she accused the addressee because the addressee didn't prove any resolutions to maintain his/her arguments and limitation in the previous round which can then make the addressee falls.

Act of accusing in datum 11 is written in bold utterance. That bold utterance is included in face threatening act. The act of accusing has threatened addressee's positive face to be admired and has the

superiority. Accusing here means underestimate the addressee's capability to maintain his/her position. Prove that he/she is unable to prove the resolution which can help him/her to stand in his/her position according to addresser's argument and his/her case doesn't fall instead.

Datum 12

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 04/03/ Pro (for) CircularLogic/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 7 | First off I disagree that my argument was emotionally involved. My claim that we don't care about the battle scenes was supported by non opinionated evidence. My argument is not that these movies should be enjoyable to every single person, but only that these movies …….. |
| 04/03/ Con (against) TheRealGod/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 8 | **You say your arguments aren't emotional but you continue to make points starting off with "I felt" the movie wasn't done poorly for the role they were made for.** They were made to show us the genius that was palpatine who was the mastermind behind everything. Turning anakin to the dark side to create his loyal warrior, manipulating him as a kid. ……. |

Analysis:

This statement is stated by con side of the house in the third round. According to con side of the house, pro is too emotional, he/she often used his/her emotion in the

previous round that is first and also second round. But the addressee didn't accept this and give rebuttal that his/her previous arguments weren't too emotional. Then in this third round, con side of the house accused the addressee if she/he wasn't too emotional so the why the addressee continued to make points starting off with "I felt" the movie wasn't done poorly for the role they were made for.

The act of accusing in datum 12 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser has threatened addressee's positive face to be admired. When someone accused him/her, it means that he/she doesn't have superiority in this debate, basically everyone wants to be admired by others instead. Everyone wants to be a perfect human, she/he wants to be always be right person in every occasion. When someone proved that they are wrong means they have to acknowledge that they are lack and of course it is contrary with his/her positive face's desire.

e. Insulting

Below analyses and descriptions are only the three sample data from 23 data as the whole data which can be found by the researcher in this online debate.

Datum 13

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 03/04/ Con (against) pittythefool/ There are no contradictions in the Bible | 6 | ……Now starting with the bible and its many vessels I have very limited primary evidence to suggest the accounts were first hand and more importantly what most are reading today is a many times translated, account of an account of an account. I fail how you could argue …… |
| 03/04/ Pro (for) ChristTheRedeemer/ There are no contradictions in the Bible | 5 | ……However, the Bible is quite different. The Bible is first hand-accounts. If you read it, you'd know. **Unless you're talking about parables or example stories. Those are quite obviously made up. So... your claim is false.** As your claims to slavery, may I add that there are verses that |

Analysis:

This statement is the addresser's rebuttal in the last round after having quite long debate in the previous round. This is the last rebuttal which is delivered by pro side of the house. They are talking about there are no contradictions in the Bible. In this case, the addresser rebutted addressee's claim in his/her previous rebuttal. The addresser claimed that addressee's claim in the previous rebuttal is false.

The act of insulting in datum 13 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser has threatened addressee's positive face. As explained in chapter two that basically everyone has positive face where positive face is the desire to respected, well thought of and so many others. By stating that the addressee's claim is false of course it has damaged addressee's positive face to be respected because everyone wants he/she is always be right and successful. When someone said that he/she is fail means she/he is lack and it is contrary with his/her positive face.

Datum 14

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 08/03/ Con (against) stephannoi/ Should america accept muslims people ? | 15 | Obviously i find muslims are stupid people.And all of them should be killed.Now,i have heard in the news ……. |
| 08/03/ Pro (for) Dilara/ Should america accept muslims people ? | 16 | **Muslims are stupid people? You can't even speak English!** Muslims make up 10% of doctors in America! Muslims invented algebra! Because of one child rape you heard about all Muslims are accountable? All 1.6billion Muslims ….. |

Analysis:

This debate seems quite dangerous and contains SARA because it is about religion that is "Should America accepts

Muslim people?". This statement is delivered by pro side of the house who agree that Muslim should be accepted by America for many reasons in the last round. In the previous round con stated that Muslims are stupid people so that is way they shouldn't be accepted by America. But in the fourth round, pro rebutted that Muslim are not stupid and give many contributions to America. People who said that Muslims are stupid mean she/he cannot even speak English and in this case refers to the addressee.

The act of insulting in datum 14 is written in bold sentence. This statement includes in insulting face threatening act because the addresser insulted the addressee that she/he cannot even speak English. The addresser has threatened addressee's positive face to be well thought of. As we know that everyone has positive face where this face has the desire to be always well thought of and admired. When addresser said *"You can't even speak English!"* means she/he is not admired by the addresser because the addresser judged she/he is unable to speak English which shows his/her lack.

Datum 15

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 10/02/ Con (against) TheLawIsOnMySide/ Is Drug Control Unconstitutional? | 19 | …..This would technically make drug control legal. Read it. What your talking about is Communism. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | The Constitution is a social contract. Read up on it,(I would recommend John Locke) but it is basically a contract you are …….. |
| 10/02/ Pro (for) pimpmaster / Is Drug Control Unconstitutional? | 20 | **Either my opponent is extremely ignorant about the constitution and what makes something constitutional, or she is not serious about a debate.** Bringing up a SCOTUS decision proves nothing. In the history of this country, there are too many times to count where a Supreme court decision is later reversed by …… |

Analysis:

This rebuttal is delivered by pro side of the house where the debate has been in the last round. This debate run twice and this rebuttal is the last rebuttal of the previous con's arguments in the first and also second round. The topic of this debate is about *"Is drug control unconstitutional?"*. The act of insulting in datum 15 is written in bold utterance. At the last round the addresser stated that the addressee is extremely ignorant about the constitution and not serious about a debate. The word *"extremely ignorant"* and also *"not serious"* indicates that the addressee is lack in this debate which is of course

contrary with addressee's positive face. Positive face is the desire to be well thought of and admired. The act of insulting indicates that the addressee has negative evaluation of some aspects of his addressee's positive face. So, this statement has threatened addressee's positive face.

f. Disagreeing

The researcher has found 11 data includes in disagreeing face threatening acts. These below analyses and descriptions are only the sample data from the whole data.

Datum 16

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 02/01/ Pro (for) pimpmaster/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 4 | I accept this debate.<br>I am not 100% infavor of 13, but I do agree that 21 is too old in the US for a legal drink. So I would like to debate this subject.<br>If my opponent would accept I would like to argue on 18 or no age restrictions, however, I am not against …….. |
| 02/02/ Con (against) moneystacker/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 3 | **I don't accept the request to debate about lowering the age of drinking to 18 for the following reasons.**<br>1. I prefer debating topics that I am very one sided on or bias about or that I simply prefer to argue one side about…. |

Analysis:

This debate is debated about the age limitations of drinking in USA. In the second round con side of the house revealed that she/he disagreed about lowering the age to 18 as proposed by pro side of the house at the first round. Disagreeing means refusing other's arguments.

The act of disagreeing in datum 16 is written in bold sentence. Disagreeing indicates that the speaker has negative evaluation of some aspects of his addressee's positive face. Everyone wants to be respected and well thought of by others. They want their arguments are accepted or refused through apologizing or others, but here the addresser directly refused her/his opponent argument. So, here the addresser has threatened addressee's positive face which includes in disagreeing act.

Datum 17

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 04/03/ Pro (for) CircularLogic/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 7 | First off I disagree that my argument was emotionally involved. My claim that we don't care about the battle scenes was supported by non opinionated evidence. My argument is not that these movies |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | should be enjoyable to every single person, but only that these movies …….. |
| 04/03/ Con (against) TheRealGod/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 8 | …. Turning anakin to the dark side to create his loyal warrior, manipulating him as a kid. **I disagree that the point of a protagonist is supposed to be someone that we can relate to**. You see it all the time, can you relate to James bonds? He always gets the ladies….. |

Analysis:

The reason why this can be included in disagreeing act is because the addressee was clearly stated that she/he disagreed towards con's rebuttal in the previous round. The act of disagreeing in datum 17 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, Addresser has threatened addressee's positive face by disagreeing opponent's argument where positive face is the desire to always be respected. By disagreeing means the addresser has violated an aspect of the addressee's positive face that is giving negative evaluation to the addressee. Basically everyone wants to always be right and supported by others.

Datum 18

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 09/01/ Pro (for) kingcripple/ | 17 | My argument for this debate is simple, if you |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allowing Refugees from Syria is an all around bad idea | | enjoy your freedoms that are bestowed upon you as an American**,** you should agree that allowing Syrian refugees is a bad idea. They only want one thing: to implement Sharia Law. In order to win this debate my opponent must effectively nullify my claim that Syrian refugees are bent on …….. |
| 09/01/ Con (against) 2cents4change / Allowing Refugees from Syria is an all around bad idea | 18 | **By your claim ALL Syrians are Muslims, which is not true**. and ALL Muslims are radicalized towards extreme religious law and using terror as a means to influence outside political powers and cultures, also not true. Republican presidential hopefuls Jeb Bush and ... |

Analysis:

This disagreeing act is not directly stated by con side of the house as the previous sample data. Con side of the house disagree the claim of pro side of the house which stated that all Syrians are Muslims. Addresser stated that this is not true. The act of disagreeing in datum 18 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser has threatened addressee's positive face to be respected by disagreeing and claiming his/her opponent's argument was not true. Because basically everyone wants his/her

arguments are agreed by others or minimally refused by others through the soft way. As explained many times above that the act of disagreeing indicates the addressee has negative evaluation of some aspects of his addressee's positive face which is needed to be fulfilled.

g. Imposing

Imposing act as face threatening act is found by the researcher in this research. The researcher only found two data as can be seen below.

Datum 19

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 02/01/ Con (against) moneystacker/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 3 | **First round is simply for acceptance.** I will now state some information to intrinsically clarify the round…… |
| 02/01/ Pro (for) pimpmaster/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 4 | I accept this debate. I am not 100% infavor of 13, but I do agree that 21 is too old in the US for a legal drink. So I would like to debate this subject. If my opponent would accept I would like to argue on 18 or no age restrictions, however, I am not against …….. |

Analysis:

The act of Imposing in datum 19 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser has threatened addressee's negative face to be free from imposition. Here the addresser imposed the addressee to follow him/her that first round is simply for acceptance where actually the addresser may do not want to accept this. But here the addressee seems has to follow it although the addresser didn't force him/her. Therefore, the addresser has threatened addressee's desire to be free from imposition and do his/her business freely without being impeded by others.

Datum 20

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 07/01/ Pro (for) UlyssesWake/ Is Imperialism Good for the United States? | 13 | **Round One is for a short premise explaining why you have taken position on this topic** and for details regarding your position.<br>Rules of Debate<br>• Take the debate seriously<br>• You are not restricted to a form of writing, you are free to write in any way you wish……. |
| 07/01/ Con (against) TheFlyingPham/ Is Imperialism Good for the United States? | 14 | I accept this debate, because America isn't a perfect country, and what gives us the right to force our way of living on other people?..... |

Analysis:

This second data is almost the same with the first data. The act of Imposing in datum 20 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser proposed this rule at the first round of the debate when the debate was just opened. In this case, the addresser has threatened addressee's negative face to be free from imposition and does his/her business freely. But here the addresser proposed the rule that round one is for short premise explaining why the addressee has taken position on this topic. The addresser seems force the addressee to do as what she/he wants to do.

h. Suggesting

These are only the sample data from 11 data as the whole data. These data showed us about suggesting act which can damage addressee's negative face.

Datum 21

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 03/02/ Pro (for) ChristTheRedeemer/ There are no contradictions in the Bible | 5 | Hi Dan, I am glad to see that you accepted this. Now, let me ask you this- are you Christian? If so, then **you should know that God does not make mistakes**. That's the first and foremost statement. The entire Bible isn't just some collection of |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | works from a bunch of crazy, insane people out in the desert compiled into one book. …… |
| 03/02/ Con (against) pittythefool/ There are no contradictions in the Bible | 6 | Hi Anthony im glad you are a believer and to answer your question? no I am not a Christian. Is there any chance you can show me where in the bible god uses vessels to actually write the bible... No offence but I kind of missed that part…… |

Analysis:

This statement is the rebuttal which is delivered by pro side of the house after having the first round debate. In this case the addresser tried to give suggestion to the addressee to know that God doesn't make mistake as the rebuttal to con side of the house's argument at the first round. Suggesting is a face threatening act because it can damage addressee's negative face. It can damage addressee's negative face because basically everyone has the desire to be free from imposition. Humans have the desire to go about their business freely without being impeded by others. The act of suggesting in datum 21 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, addresser has threatened addressee's negative face because it indicates that the addresser intends to impede his/her addressee's freedom of action. Freedom here is

addressee’s freedom to argue as what she/he wants without any suggestions to change his/her argument.

Datum 22

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 04/02/ Pro (for) CircularLogic/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 7 | they were such static characters.<br>I apologize in that I have never seen the LOTR movies and therefore cannot make the same connection you did, but you say that the prequels weren't intended to be a space adventure, and you are perfectly right, so then why, when I look up the prequels, are they listed as action/adventure scifi movies?<br>…… |
| 04/02/ Con (against) TheRealGod/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 8 | …. so you felt let down, however that doesn't mean the prequels are inferior.<br>Closing: **even if you watched the original before the prequels you should be able to appreciate both trilogy.**<br>Watching the movies they are great they are not inferior to the original. Just because it has a different way of telling a story doesn't make it inferior….. |

Analysis:

That statement is closing rebuttal which is proposed by the addresser at the second round. This is debated about

the star wars prequels were significantly inferior to the star war original trilogy. Here the addresser rebutted the addressee by stating that even the addressee has watched the original before the prequels, the addresser gives suggestion to the addressee should be able to appreciate both trilogy.

The act of suggesting in datum 22 is written in bold utterance. This suggesting act can be included at face threatening act because here the addresser has threatened addressee's negative face to be free from imposition and does his/her business freely without being impeded by others. But by suggesting, the addresser has asked the addressee to move to the argument where actually the addressee doesn't want to argue which means the addresser has impeded addressee's freedom.

Datum 23

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 09/01/ Pro (for) kingcripple/ Allowing Refugees from Syria is an all around bad idea | 17 | My argument for this debate is simple, if you enjoy your freedoms that are bestowed upon you as an American**, you should agree that allowing Syrian refugees is a bad idea.** **T**hey only want one thing: to implement Sharia Law.<br>In order to win this debate my opponent must effectively nullify my claim that Syrian |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | refugees are bent on carrying out ISIS's plan …… |
| 09/01/ Con (against) 2cents4change / Allowing Refugees from Syria is an all around bad idea | 18 | By your claim ALL Syrians are Muslims, which is not true, and ALL Muslims are radicalized towards extreme religious law and using terror as a means to influence outside political powers and cultures, also not true. Republican presidential hopefuls Jeb Bush and ... |

Analysis:

This statement is an opening argument which is proposed by pro side of the house at the first round. This debate is debated about allowing refugees from Syria is an all around bad idea where pro agree with this motion and con of course disagree with this motion. Here, at the first round, the addresser gave a suggestion to agree that allowing Syrian refugees is bad idea where con side of the house is actually disagree with the motion.

The act of suggesting in datum 23 is written in bold sentence. In this utterance, the addresser has threatened addressee's negative face because as explain many times above that everyone has the desire to be free from imposition and does his/her business freely without being impeded by

others. But here the addresser has bothered addressee's freedom to take his/her position freely by asking him/her to agree that allowing Syrian refugees is a bad idea.

i. Self humiliating

Below analyses and descriptions are only the sample data from 5 data which have been found by the researcher in this research about self humiliating act which can damage addressee's positive face.

Datum 24

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 03/03/ Pro (for) ChristTheRedeemer/ There are no contradictions in the Bible | 5 | One example of God using us humans as vessels for His work? Moses, Noah, Jonah, and many more. You see, Dan, that there are so many people in the Bible that God used, spoke to, influenced, showed signs to, etc. Not to mention that just about every author of the Bible are people that are influenced by God (especially in the New Testament). You said there were added falsifications? Where? Most of the books of the Bible are personal accounts written by people, not documents or anything…… |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 03/03/ Con (against) pittythefool/ There are no contradictions in the Bible | 6 | Unfortunately Anthony I not only feel that the bible has contradictions but I also believe the church has proven to be not only contradictory but In many respects not only unholy but inhumane also**.**<br>Now starting with the bible and its many vessels **I have very limited primary evidence** to suggest the accounts were first hand and more importantly what most are reading today is a many times translated ….. |

Analysis:

This statement appeared in round 3 where the debate has run three times. The opponent has given more supporting arguments in round 2 and round 1 than the addressee so the addressee stated "*I have very limited primary evidence to suggest"* because he/she may feel that his/her arguments weaker and there is no other evidences to support his/her own arguments.

The act of self humiliating in datum 24 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser has threatened his/her own positive face by stating *"I have very limited primary evidence…."* means he/she did self – humiliating that she/he cannot prove more evidences instead of everyone has the desire to be well thought of. "*I have very limited*

*primary evidence…."* means the addresser has acknowledged him/her that she/he wasn't capable to prove more evidences.

Datum 25

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 02/02/ Pro (for) pimpmaster/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 4 | ……My opponent feels the US population is unable to handle drinking at a younger age. However for his specific point offers nothing but an opinion. The truth is underage drinking occurs regardless of the legality. My opponents assertion is that the legality prevents adolescents from obtaining alcohol….. |
| 02/03/ Con (against) moneystacker/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 3 | ….His contention 6 just gives me the burden of provide empirics and I did that already the same article shows that of adults who started drinking before 15 40% develop alcohol dependence as well. It's pretty much impossible to compare empirics for not drinking at 13 to ludicrous opinions/theories for video games leading to violent activities.<br>His biggest argument is his only contention left #7 and his main argument which I almost failed to address which would have led to a lose for me in the round.<br>**I fail to prove that the drinking prohibition works.** Man if only my opponent competed in debate. I only have to disprove the resolution. The pro has the burden of |

solvency……

Analysis:

This debate is debated about lowering drinking age in USA. This statement is delivered when the debate has been in the third round where son side of the house tried hard to give the best rebuttals and also arguments in order to be the winner in this debate. But, in this round of the debate, con side of the house seems miss a point after giving long explanations till she acknowledges his/her lack which can damage addresser's positive face.

The act of self humiliating in datum 25 is written in bold sentence. That sentence *"I fail to prove that the drinking prohibition works"* has threatened addresser's positive face to be well thought of and respected. The act of self humiliating necessarily threatens the addresser's positive face since it foregrounds the addresser's weakness and ignores his strengths.

Datum 26

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 03/02/ Pro (for) ChristTheRedeemer/ There are no contradictions in the Bible | 5 | Hi Dan, I am glad to see that you accepted this. Now, let me ask you this- are you Christian? If so, then you should know that God does not make mistakes. That's |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | the first and foremost statement. The entire Bible isn't just some collection of works from a bunch of crazy, insane people out in the desert compiled into one book…… |
| 03/02/ Con (against) pittythefool/ There are no contradictions in the Bible | 6 | Hi Anthony im glad you are a believer and to answer your question? no I am not a Christian. Is there any chance you can show me where in the bible god uses vessels to actually write the bible... **No offence but I kind of missed that part.** Look i'm not criticising the bible for what it could be. Though I must point out there has been just a few additions, subtractions and political falsifications ….. |

Analysis:

In this case, the addresser wanted to rebut the addressee towards his/her previous arguments. Here, the addresser asked the addressee to show him/her again where in the bible god uses vessels to actually write the bible. The addresser was also stated that he/she didn't want to against but the addresser has acknowledged his/her lack because she/he kind of missed the part.

The act of self humiliating in datum 26 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser has

threatened his/her positive face because by doing self humiliating act the addresser has threatened his/her positive face since it foregrounds the addresser's weakness and ignores addresser's strengths. Basically, positive face is the desire to be respected, admired, well thought of and so many others but here the addresser's showed his/her lack by stating that she/he failed instead. So, it damages his/her own face because it is contrary with his/her positive face wants.

j. Apologizing

The act of apologizing can bee seen here as addresser's face threatening acts. Here are only the sample data from 5 data as the whole data which can be found by the researcher.

Datum 27

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 03/04/ Con (against) pittythefool/ There are no contradictions in the Bible | 6 | Unfortunately Anthony I not only feel that the bible has contradictions but I also believe the church has proven to be not only contradictory but In many respects not only unholy but inhumane also**.** Now starting with the bible and its many vessels I have very limited primary evidence to suggest the accounts were first hand and more importantly what most are reading today is a |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | many times translated, account of an account of an account. I fail how you could argue your point knowing this information.. |
| 03/04/ Pro (for) ChristTheRedeemer/ There are no contradictions in the Bible | 5 | **Oh, I apologize, and should have mentioned it before- I am using the King James Version. The other versions aren't as reliable.** If you are referring to that time people not writing it down for many generations, then youre right. theyre often perceived as legends. …… |

Analysis:

This apologizing appeared in round 4 where the debate has run three times. The rebuttal and also best arguments have given to each other. The opponent side of the house has given stronger and better rebuttal to the addresser till the addresser cannot rebut the addressee's arguments then finally the addresser apologized to the addressee about his/her mistakes.

The act of apologizing in datum 27 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser has threatened his/her positive face by apologizing. By apologizing, means that the addresser ignored his/her desire to always be right because she/he must acknowledge her/his mistakes. The act

of apologizing damages the addresser's positive face because the addresser regrets doing prior FTA. Regretting a prior action, the addresser admits his/her mistake and to some degree it damages his own face.

Datum 28

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 04/01/ Con (against) TheRealGod/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 8 | …..LOTR our heroes set off on a journey to mordor, but much like the prequels they try to warn other nations of the imminent danger, ones being the sith the other sauron, now either nations didn't take them seriously or they just didn't care. Which were those nations downfall.……. |
| 04/02/ Pro (for) CircularLogic/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 7 | ….. You can argue that the massive battles and duels provide tension, but I never felt my prequel heroes in any danger when cutting down dozens of battle droids with seemingly no effort. In the original trilogy the constant impending danger, coupled with our actual caring for the characters, made us emotionally involved with what was going on to them and around them. I just never felt the same emotional connection when characters like Mace Windu and Qui-Gon died, because they were |

such static characters. **I apologize in that I have never seen the LOTR movies** and therefore cannot make the same connection you did……

Analysis:

This statement is delivered at the second round of the debate while the addresser was giving the rebuttal towards the addressee towards the motion about star war prequels and star war trilogy. In this case, the addresser gave long arguments as the rebuttal towards addressee's long arguments at the first round. The addresser seems missed a part as the material to his/her rebuttal until she/he apologized to the addressee because she/he has never seen the LOTR movies therefore cannot make same connections as what the addressee did.

The act of apologizing in datum 28 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser has threatened addresser's positive face by doing the act of apologizing. Everyone has positive face that is the desire to be well thought of by others. By doing an apologizing act means the addresser ignored his/her positive face because she/he must acknowledge his/her mistake. This act of apologizing damages the addresser's positive face since it indicates that the addresser

regrets doing a prior FTA. Regretting a prior action, the addresser admits his/her mistakes.

Datum 29

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 05/01/ Pro (for) Aurigae54 / Democracy is not the Best Form of Government | 10 | My argument is that Democracy is not the best form of government, and in fact, many non-democratic forms of government are better.<br>I define best as:<br>The most successful and superior form of government. In other words the best form of government is the government that is most capable of improving the economic, technological, and developmental situations of a state.……. |
| 05/02/ Con (against) the_banjo_sender/ Democracy is not the Best Form of Government | 9 | Oh very well. |
| 05/02/ Pro (for) Aurigae54 / Democracy is not the Best Form of Government | 10 | Con -<br>Because of Christmas and New Years, I've been busier than I thought I would be, and I havent had time to thoroughly lay out my position on this issue. I made this argument five rounds partly for this reason, and I hope you can willingly forfeit round 2 (as I am) so we can pick up the |

argument in round 3. I think thats rounds 3, 4, and 5 should be adequate for each of us to lay out and defend our arguments.

**Sorry about this, it was a mistake on my part to start a debate between Christmas and New Years.**

Analysis:

This debate was running only twice. This debate is opened by con side of the house without giving any arguments. Quite long arguments were given by pro side of the house at the first round then it was continued at the second round. Con side of the house seems doesn't have no idea about this debate because at the first and also the second round she/he didn't propose any arguments.

However, the addresser as pro side of the house still gave the rebuttal to the addressee in this last round. But, the addresser seems slip of the tongue in giving the arguments. The addresser was talking about Christmas and New Years while this debate is debated about democracy is not the best form of government. In the end of the debate the addresser

apologized to the addressee because she/he made mistakes in starting the debate about Christmas and New Years.

The act of apologizing in datum 29 is written in bold utterance. This act of apologizing has threatened the addresser's positive face as explained at the previous sample. Because of by acknowledging his/he mistake means she/he ignored his/her positive face's desire to always be well thought of. The addresser regrets his/her prior FTA. By regretting his/her prior action, the addresser admits his/her mistakes.

k. Complimenting

In this research, the researcher has only found 1 datum containing complimenting act as face threatening act which is done by the debater.

Datum 30

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 10/01/Con (against) The LawIsOnMy Side/ Is Drug Control Unconstitutional? | 19 | ….I feel drug control is Constitutional. Living in Colorado, I have seen many children become addicted to Marijuana when underage. Drug control is fully legal, with many states suing Colorado for letting people under the influence of Marijuana cross to their states. Drug control is fully needed. |
| 10/01/ Pro (for) | 20 | …..Drugs such as Maraijuana as pointed |

| | |
|---|---|
| pimpmaster / Is Drug Control Unconstitutional? | out by my opponent are dangerous, and arguably addictive. However, my opponent is making the assertion that the government's purpose is to protect the individual against his own poor choices. The constitution is there to prevent encroachments. **My opponent makes a valid case argument but does so at the cost of everything else he believes in**. Once you open up the government to regulate or disallow a substance the population then gives up those rights. What is next? Perhaps ……. |

Analysis:

This statement is delivered by pro side of the house at the first round while she/he was giving the rebuttal to the addressee's previous arguments. The act of complimenting in datum 30 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser has complimented the addressee's good deed because the addressee has made valid case arguments at the first round. In this case the addresser has threatened his/her own positive face. It has threatened addresser's positive face

because the addresser has acknowledged his/her addressee's superiority or good deed that is making valid case arguments in this case. Therefore the addresser has damaged his/her own positive face because basically everyone wants she/he is the only one who has superiority.

l. Ordering

Below analysis and description is the sample data from the two data as the whole data which have been found by the researcher in this research about ordering act as face threatening act which is done by the debater.

Datum 31

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 06/01/ Con (against) BlazingRodent/ If you imaigne it to get the answer, you might aswell imagine the opposite | 12 | So, the resolution states that "*if you imaigne it to get the answer, you might aswell imagine the opposite*" For my arguments, I will be using an example to prove my opponent wrong. But before I use my example, let me point out that the resolution is incoherent due to the sub par grammar that is taking place and the lack of a connection between …. |
| 06/02/ Pro (for) vi_spex/ If you imaigne it to get the answer, you | 11 | maybe some one kicked it of the tree with some advanced kick, maybe not **my point is they are both imaginary, tell** |

| | |
|---|---|
| might aswell imagine the opposite | **me this, which force caused the apple to fall?** |

Analysis:

This statement is delivered by pro side of the house at the second round in order to respond addressee's previous arguments. In responding or rebutting the opponent, the addresser seems missed a part or didn't understand yet about some points. The act of ordering in datum 31 is written in bold utterance. In that utterance, the addresser asked the addressee to tell him/her about which force caused the apple to fall. This ordering act which was done by the addresser has threatened addressee's negative face to be free from imposition and the desire to go about their business freely without being impeded by others. But this act has threatened addressee's negative face since it intends to impede his addressee's freedom of action.

m. Asking to stop doing activity

Datum 32

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 03/02/ Con (against) pittythefool/ There are no contradiction s in the BIble | 6 | Hi Anthony im glad you are a believer and to answer your question? no I am not a Christian. Is there any chance you can show me where in the bible god uses vessels to |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 03/03/ Pro (for) ChristTheRedeemer/ There are no contradictions in the BIble | 5 | actually write the bible... No offence but I kind of missed that part.<br>Look i'm not criticising the bible for what it could be. Though I must point out there has been just a few additions……<br>…. Not to mention that just about every author of the Bible are people that are influenced by God (especially in the New Testament). You said there were added falsifications? Where? Most of the books of the Bible are personal accounts written by people, not documents or anything.<br>**But anyway, let's get back onto the contradictions**. I know of many false contradictions that have been cleared up and been taken back into reality (some 430 or so)…… |

Analysis:

This statement is delivered by pro side of the house at the third round while she/he was giving the rebuttal to the addressee's previous arguments. This statement has threatened addressee's negative face to go about his/her business freely without being impeded by others because the

addresser asked the addressee back onto the contradictions where the addressee may doesn't want to do it. Asking to stop doing the activity of course threatens other's negative face since the addressee may still want to do that activity but she/he is asked to stop it. This utterance is written in bold utterance in datum 32.

n. Criticizing

The researcher has only found one data containing criticizing as face threatening act which is done by the debater in this research.

Datum 33

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 04/01/ Pro (for) CircularLogic/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 7 | ….Writing: This one is more example oriented, so here are examples of some lines that made absolutely no sense and/or were used solely to keep the plot together<br>1: "They must be dead by now. Destroy what's left of them."- Nute Gunray, Phantom menace<br>2: "Don't try it Anakin, I have the high ground" -Obi-Wan, Revenge of the Sith….. |
| 04/01/ Con (against) TheRealGod/ The Star Wars Prequels | 8 | ….Characters and writing would be a matter of personal opinion, like we can all agree jar jar was a bs character. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | | **You also give quotes on writing but don't give any context, The only one I can refer 2 is number two which shows how wreckless anakin can be.** Summary/closing The main issue with the prequels isn't that it's supposed to be a space adventure movie …… |

Analysis:

This statement is actually the rebuttals which were proposed by con side of the house towards the addressee at the first round. In this rebuttal, the addresser has criticized addressee's previous arguments. The addresser has criticized that the addressee gave quotes on writing but didn't give any context. This act of criticizing has threatened addressee's positive face because the addresser blamed the addressee for having done something badly. This act indicates that the addresser has negative evaluation of some aspects of his addressee's positive face. That utterance is written in bold utterance in datum 33.

o. Annoying

Datum 34

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 09/01/ Con (against) 2cents4chang | 18 | By your claim ALL Syrians are Muslims, which is not true and |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| e<br>/ Allowing Refugees from Syria is an all around bad idea | | ALL Muslims are radicalized towards extreme religious law and using terror as a means to influence outside political powers and cultures, also not true.<br><br>Republican presidential hopefuls Jeb Bush and ... |
| 09/02/ Pro (for) kingcripple/ Allowing Refugees from Syria is an all around bad idea | 17 | …… The vast majority are combat aged men)[1], it's better to be safe than sorry. **Let me ask my opponent a personal question**. Going through your profile, I could not gauge whether you were, Jewish, Christian, Atheist etc. I could not gauge whether you were straight or gay….. |

Analysis:

In this second round the addresser wanted to ask personal question to the addressee. This act can be included into annoying act because the addresser has annoyed the addressee because she/he wanted to know addressee's personal matter. Personal matter is usually a secret which won't be shared to others. Therefore, the addresser has threatened his/her addressee's negative face to be free from imposition. In this case is the addressee has to explain to the

addresser about his/her personal matter because she/he is asked by the addresser. Again, it has threatened addressee's negative face because humans have the desire to go about their business freely and without being impeded by others. That utterance is written in bold utterance in datum 34.

**2. Politeness Strategies performed by the debaters**

In this part presents 9 types of politeness strategies which are found from 13 data by the researcher: Using Exclamation, asking for permission, Agreeing, Complimenting, Using conventional indirect, Including both speaker and addressee in an activity, Giving reason, Noticing addressee's good deeds, and Giving Freedom. Below analyses are all the data which have been found in this research containing politeness strategies in order to soften the face threatening acts.

a. Using Exclamation

The researcher has only found 1 datum containing face threatening act which is minimized by using exclamation as his/her politeness strategies. Below is the analysis and the description.

Datum 35

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 01/01/ Pro (for) fire_wings (FW)/Does age matter on | 2 | I accept. Arguments in the next round |

this website?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 01/02/ Con (against) Themeaman909 (T909)/Does age matter on this website? | 1 | I would first like to give my general reason for choosing con,stereotypes.<br><br>1)"Sociology. a simplified and standardized conception or image invested with special meaning and held in common by members of a group." ( http://dictionary.reference.com... ).<br>A stereotype is when you assume that someone/something is a certain way.<br>Everyone uses stereotypes on objects to ……<br>**Please consider my points,** and I am looking forward to your debate. |

Analysis:

The bold utterance in datum 35 is stated by the con side of the house after delivering his/her long arguments in the second round. Pro side of the house wanted his/her opponent considered his/her long explanations or arguments before giving the rebuttal in the next round. Everyone wants to be free from imposition. They want to be free to do their business as what they want to do. But here the addresser has threatened his/her addressee’s negative face to be free from

imposition by asking the addressee to consider his/her point. Before imposing addressee to force her/him to consider addresser's points, the addresser tried to use mitigating device that was *"please"* to minimize the potential face damage due to the FTAs.

Comparing this sentence *"Please consider my points, and I am looking forward to your debate"* and this sentence *"consider my points, and I am looking forward to your debate"*, the first sentence is heard more polite than the second one because there is an addition the word 'please' which seems like an offering to the addressee whether she/he wants to consider or not while in the second sentence the addressee's negative face will be damaged because the addresser directly asked the addressee seems like the addresser force the addressee to follow him/her to consider. Two explanations below are still about performing face threatening acts towards addressee's negative face by using mitigating devices in order to minimize it.

b. Asking for permission

Below analyses are the data containing asking for permission act as politeness strategies used by the debater in order to soften face threatening act.

Datum 36

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 02/01/ Con (against) moneystacker / The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 3 | First round is simply for acceptance. I will now state some information to intrinsically clarify the round.<br>Reason why this topic: I had this topic for a debate in congress and a lot of people actually believed in this. Also a friend yesterday told me how this would work so I am curious to hear more on it.<br>Definition:<br>Drinking=of or relating to the act of drinking of alcohol |
| 02/01/ Pro (for) pimpmaster/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 4 | I accept this debate.<br>I am not 100% infavor of 13, but I do agree that 21 is too old in the US for a legal drink. So I would like to debate this subject.<br>**If my opponent would accept I would like to argue on 18 or no age restrictions, however, I am not against**<br>…….. |

Analysis:

The bold statement in datum 36 was delivered in the first round where the debate was begun by the con side of the house by giving some rules and also long arguments. Here, the statement is the rebuttal to the con side of the house about his/her limitation towards the age of the topic. The addresser

here tried to used mitigating device before threatening addressee's negative face to be free from imposition in order to soften the face threatening act by giving assumption that is *"If my opponent would accept"* before asking her/his addressee to accept her/his proposal limitation about the age to be 18 years old. By directly asking the addressee to accept the addresser's proposal limitation, it may threaten addressee's face to be free from imposition. But, by minimizing it by giving an assumption before threatening addressee's negative face, it is expected can minimize the FTA.

Datum 37

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 09/01/ Con (against) 2cents4change / Allowing Refugees from Syria is an all around bad idea | 18 | By your claim ALL Syrians are Muslims, which is not true and ALL Muslims are radicalized towards extreme religious law and using terror as a means to influence outside political powers and cultures, also not true.<br><br>Republican presidential hopefuls Jeb Bush and ... |
| 09/02/ Pro (for) kingcripple/ Allowing Refugees from Syria is | 17 | Can I acknowledge my opponent makes good points without making it seem that I am conceeding anything? |

an all around bad idea

I fear I cannot.

However his arguments DO infact have some gaping holes**.** I can acknowledge that not all Syrians are Muslim. But with a crappy vetting process, or no vetting process at all, how do we know this for sure? More specifically, how do we know that the refugees coming into America are not Muslim? If we are to say, "they are Muslim, so what?" then how do we know they are not radicalized? WE DON'T. nd since Glorious Leader Obama refuses to vet these combat aged men (where are the widows and children he has spoken about? The vast majority are combat aged men)[1], it's better to be safe than sorry.

**Let me ask my opponent a personal question**. Going through your profile, I could not gauge whether you were, Jewish, Christian, Atheist etc. I could not gauge whether you were straight or gay…..

Analysis:

The bold statement in datum 37 was delivered by pro side of the house while she/he was giving the rebuttal. The addresser seems want to know something behind the addressee to make it as a material in his/her next rebuttal or arguments. The addresser wanted to ask a personal question to the addressee. Commonly humans' personal matter won't be shared by them because it is personal. But here the addresser has threatened his/her addressee's negative face to be free from imposition because she/he is asked to tell his/her personal matter which is actually won't be shared.

While doing prior FTA, the addresser used mitigating devices in order to soften face threatening act. The addresser was asking addressee's permission that she/he wants to know addressee's personal matter by stating *"Let me…."*. It is more polite rather than this question is delivered directly by stating *"Tell me your personal question"*. Therefore, this statement is included in asking for permission as politeness strategies in this case.

c. Agreeing

This act of agreeing as politeness strategy which is found by the researcher in order to soften his/her face threatening act. The researcher has only found 1 datum in this research as explained below.

Datum 38

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 02/01/ Pro (for) pimpmaster/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 4 | I accept this debate. I am not 100% infavor of 13, but I do agree that 21 is too old in the US for a legal drink. So I would like to debate this subject. If my opponent would accept I would like to argue on 18 or no age restrictions, however, I am not against …….. |
| 02/02/ Con (against) moneystacker / The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 3 | …..He brings up 1 argument that is relatable to drinking at 13 and that is the fact that the law to not drink at 21 does not prevent younger people from obtaining acholhal. **I agree to this but only to a certain extent**. First of all there isn't a way to 100% prevent anyone ….. |

Analysis:

This bold statement in datum 38 was stated by pro side of the house in the second round when the debate has run once. Here the addresser showed his disagreement to a certain context by using agreeing politeness strategy. Why it can be included in agreeing as politeness strategy? Because for the first the addresser stated that she/he agreed, but at the next sentence the addresser stated that she/he only agreed to a certain context. Means she/he doesn't fully agree with the

whole arguments. This disagreement was not directly showed by the addresser, but it is covered by agreeing strategy in order to minimize face threatening act.

d. Complimenting

These two data are complimenting politeness strategy used by the debater in order to minimize face threatening act which have been found by the researcher.

Datum 39

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 02/02/ Con (against) moneystacker / The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 3 | I don't accept the request to debate about lowering the age of drinking to 18 for the following reasons.<br>1. I prefer debating topics that I am very one sided on or bias about or that I simply prefer to argue one side about. The reason being is because sometimes someone is able to convey me to realize the other side is better and it actually helps me be more open minded…… |
| 02/02/ Pro (for) pimpmaster/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 4 | To my opponent**. I accept your reasons and I appreciate your consideration and rationale. You gave more response than was necessary. I did not need a long winded answer, I know space is limited in these debates.** I |

hope this did not adversely affect your ability to present you position.
1. My opponent feels the US population is unable to handle drinking at a younger age. However for his specific point offers nothing but an opinion.
……

Analysis:

This bold statement in datum 39 is stated in the second round where the debate was opened by the con side of the house which then rebutted by the pro side of the house. In the second round the debate is continued. Pro's arguments were rebutted a lot by the con side of the house. Finally the pro side of the house may feel uncomfortable which a lot of explanations and arguments which are given till she/he stated "*I appreciate your consideration and rationale. You gave more response than was necessary"* before stated "*I did not need a long winded answer".*

This means that the addresser used mitigating devices by commending the addresser who has given more responses than was necessary and also the addresser highly appreciate towards addressee's consideration and rationale to counteract the potential face damage due to the FTAs before stating that

actually the addresser didn’t need long winded answer which can damage addressee’s positive face to be respected. We have to remember that everyone has the desire to be respected. After giving long explanations or arguments and on the contrary the person who you give to stated that she/he didn’t need your long explanations so of course his/her positive face to be respected and admired has been threatened. The next data performing face threatening acts towards addressee’s positive by using mitigating devices can be seen below.

Datum 40

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 04/01/ Con (against) TheRealGod/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 8 | …..The original was a constant adventure cause our heroes were being hunted down. The heroes here got to relax a bit more. Okay now that, that is out of the way, I can say the plot is closer to lord of the rings. LOTR our heroes set off on a journey to mordor, but much like the prequels they try to warn other nations of the imminent danger, ones being the sith the other sauron, now either nations didn't take them seriously or they just didn't care. Which were those nations downfall…… |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 04/02/ Pro (for) CircularLogic/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 7 | ……I apologize in that I have never seen the LOTR movies and therefore cannot make the same connection you did, but **you say that the prequels weren't intended to be a space adventure, and you are perfectly right, so then why, when I look up the prequels, are they listed as action/adventure scifi movies**?<br>Rebuttal for battles: While the battles were naturally better looking with the CGI and choreography, they lacked any form of substance, …….. |

Analysis:

This is the rebuttal from the addresser to addressee's argument at the first round. In this rebuttal contains politeness strategy used by addresser in order to soften his/her face threatening act that is disagreeing act. This politeness strategy is complimenting strategy. It can be included in politeness strategy because for the first the addresser agreed with addressee's argument that is about prequels weren't intended to be space adventure. This agreement can be seen from addresser's statement *"....you are perfectly right"*. This statement is actually his/her politeness strategy to soften his/her face threatening act that

is disagreement act *"so then why, when I look up the prequels, are they listed as action/adventure scifi movies?"*. The addresser gave an agreement at the first statement which is then followed by disagreement act. This utterance is written in bold utterance in datum 40.

e. Using conventional indirect

From the whole data, the researcher has only found one datum containing Using conventional indirect politeness strategy in minimizing face threatening act.

Datum 41

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 02/03/ Con (against) moneystacker / The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more responisible drinking | 3 | To explain this further where I went middle school in a middle class area drinking wasn't an issue, however my Uncle taught in a poor area in Houston in HISD where 13 year olds getting pregnant was normal. He doesn't show that this statistic isn't just like the beauro statistic that 1 out of 3 black people go to jail. Mostly applies to poor areas….. |
| 02/03/ Pro (for) pimpmaster/ The USA should lower the drinking age to 13 to promote more | 4 | ….. If so, I suggest he move to another neighborhood. 3. **Can my opponent show how raising the legal age to consume alcohol will equate to more responsible drinking statistics?** If |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| responisible drinking | | not, then we must consider a new paradigm if we want to change the course of alcoholism in the US….. |

Analysis:

Seemingly, the addressee's arguments written in bold utterance are not clearly yet. So, the addresser proposed an ordering act to the addressee which is considered as face threatening act. Because by ordering, the addresser will threaten his/her addressee's negative face to be free from imposition. But here, in order to minimize the act, the addresser used conventional indirect negative politeness strategy by using modal *"can…"*. This modal seems can change the mood of the language to be more polite in threatening addressee's negative face.

f. Including both speaker and addressee in an activity

Below analysis is datum which is found by the researcher containing politeness strategy as his/her mitigating device.

Datum 42

| **Code** | **Debater** | **Utterances** |
|---|---|---|
| 03/02/ Con (against) pittythefool/ There are no contradiction s in the BIble | 6 | Hi Anthony im glad you are a believer and to answer your question? no I am not a Christian. Is there any chance you can show me where in the bible |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 03/03/ Pro (for) ChristTheRedeemer/ There are no contradictions in the BIble | 5 | god uses vessels to actually write the bible... No offence but I kind of missed that part.<br>Look i'm not criticising the bible for what it could be. Though I must point out there has been just a few additions……<br>….Most of the books of the Bible are personal accounts written by people, not documents or anything.<br>**But anyway, let's get back onto the contradictions**. I know of many false contradictions that have been cleared up and been taken back into reality (some 430 or so)…… |

Analysis:

This statement written in bold utterance in datum 42 is stated by pro side of the house in the third round where there have been a lot of arguments which delivered either by pro side of the house or con side of the house. Pro side of the house may feel that the debate in round 3 wider than in round 1 and 2. Pro side of the house seems wants to focus on the bible contradiction. So, when the debate will almost go out from the topic, pro stated *"let's get back onto the contradictions".*

The addresser has threatened addressee's positive face by asking to stop doing an activity but he/she used positive politeness strategy that was including both speakers and his addressee in an activity by stating *"Let's…."*. As we know that positive politeness strategy is oriented to addressee's positive face. Positive politeness is approach – based. It means that the potential damage due to a certain act can be minimized by 'approaching' the addressee in this case. Approaching here can be realized by including both speakers as stated above. Below explanation is still about performing face threatening act towards the addressee's positive face by using mitigating devices.

g. Giving reason

Below is one datum which has been found by the researcher in order to minimize addresser's positive face

Datum 43

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 04/01/ Pro (for) CircularLogic/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 7 | First a disclaimer: I am new to this site and it's customs in terms of structure and style of arguments, **as I came here to specifically argue this point, so my argument structure may not match the norm of this site.** I want the first round to be just opening statements, |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | with the second and third being rebuttal and counter rebuttal, and the last being concluding arguments. Also since we will be discussing events from six, full length movies I would like to organize the structure of each individual argument into 6 sections as to not get jumbled and difficult to follow. They are as follows:<br>1: Characters<br>2: Plot…… |
| 04/01/ Con (against) TheRealGod/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 8 | My opening statement is going to start off with the plot.<br>Plot: George Lucas wanted to tell a different story In a different. The main difference was the ERA the prequels started out in a time of peace while the original started out in an oppressive state.…… |

Analysis:

Still in the fourth topic in the first round, as explained above that in this topic the debate has opened by the pro side of the house. Because she/he has opened the debate, she/he seems feeling afraid and doubt to argue in the first time. It can be seen from the statement above *"as I came here to*

*specifically argue this point, so my argument structure may not match the norm of this site".*

This politeness strategy is written in bold utterance in datum 43. In this case, the addresser has threatened his/her own positive face to be respected by self - humiliating*"my argument structure may not match the norm of this site"*but for the first she/he used strategy by stating *"as I came here to specifically argue this point".* So he/she has done addresser's positive face threatening act strategy in order to minimize his/her face threatening act towards him/her own face. As explained many times that everyone wants to be respected. Knowing that his/her arguments will not match, in order to minimize the threatening acts towards his/her own face so, she/he stated that actually she/he only wants to specifically argue the point.

h. Noticing addressee's good deeds

The researcher has found one datum containing politeness strategy which is used by the debater in order to minimize his/her face threatening act.

Datum 44

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 04/01/ Pro (for) CircularLogic/ The Star Wars | 7 | ….Writing: This one is more example oriented, so here are examples of some lines that made absolutely no sense |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | | and/or were used solely to keep the plot together<br>1: "They must be dead by now. Destroy what's left of them."- Nute Gunray, Phantom menace<br>2: "Don't try it Anakin, I have the high ground" -Obi-Wan, Revenge of the Sith….. |
| 04/01/ Con (against) TheRealGod/ The Star Wars Prequels were significantly inferior to the Star Wars original trilogy | 8 | ….Even if Vader prevented it with his own force he should have been able to survive that fall with the force.<br>Characters and writing would be a matter of personal opinion, like we can all agree jar jar was a bs character.<br>**You also give quotes on writing but don't give any context, The only one I can refer 2 is number two which shows how wreckless anakin can be.**<br><br>Summary/closing<br>The main issue with the prequels isn't that it's supposed to be a space adventure movie like the original trilogy….. |

Analysis:

The statement above was stated when the debate still in the first round where the debate has opened by pro side of the house by giving some rules and also some arguments.

Based on the researcher's analysis, con side of the house giving the rebuttal to the pro but in the middle of his/her rebuttal she/he found unclear arguments or explanations. So, she/he stated *"You also give quotes on writing but don't give any context".*

This politeness strategy is written in bold utterance in datum 44. Here, the addresser has threatened addressee's positive face by stating that she/he didn't give any context. In has threatened addressee's positive face because everyone wants to be respected and admired by others. By stating that the addressee didn't give any context means that she/he isn't capable to make his/her own best arguments or rebuttal so it has damaged his/her positive face. But before doing this face threatening act the addresser used a strategy by commending that was *"You also give quotes"* in order to minimized the FTA and to counteract the potential face damage due to the FTA. Below analysis and description are still about positive politeness strategy which is used to minimize face threatening acts towards the addresser's positive face which is only found one datum from the whole data.

i. Giving freedom

In this research, the researcher has found two data containing politeness strategy used by the debater in order to soften his/her face threatening act.

Datum 45

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 05/01/ Con (against) the_banjo_sender/ Democracy is not the Best Form of Government | 9 | I will allow you to further build your case in round two. I therefore only accept this challenge. May the better person win! |
| 05/01/ Pro (for) Aurigae54 / Democracy is not the Best Form of Government | 10 | …. From a social standpoint, it is logical to prevent less capable citizens from voting simply because they do not understand politics enough to know what is good for themselves or the nation.<br><br>**Con can feel free to rebut me and create his own arguments in his acceptance response, but if Con would rather just accept only, that is equally okay.**<br>Two forfeits is an automatic loss. |

Analysis:

This bold statement in datum 45 is delivered by pro side of the house at the first round where the debate was just opened. In this case, the addresser used negative politeness strategy. The addresser has fulfilled addressee's negative face to be

free from imposition and go about his/her business freely without being impeded by others by allowing the opponent to be free to rebut and create his/her own arguments in the acceptance response. The addresser has also given freedom to the addressee to would rather just accept only, that was equally okay.

Datum 46

| Code | Debater | Utterances |
|---|---|---|
| 05/01/ Con (against) the_banjo_sender/ Democracy is not the Best Form of Government | 9 | **I will allow you to further build your case in round two. I therefore only accept this challenge. May the better person win!** |
| 05/01/ Pro (for) Aurigae54 / Democracy is not the Best Form of Government | 10 | My argument is that Democracy is not the best form of government, and in fact, many non-democratic forms of government are better. I define best as: The most successful and superior form of government. In other words the best form of government ……. |

Analysis:

This bold statement in datum 46 is stated by addresser at the first round when the debate was just opened by the addresser. The addresser opened the debate by allowing the opponent to build his/her case at next round. In this case, the

addresser didn't do face threatening acts. Here the addresser has used negative politeness strategy again in order to fulfill addressee's negative face to be free from imposition by allowing him/her to further build the case in round two. The addresser gave the addressee a freedom to do his/her business freely without being impeded by addresser. Addressee's business here is his/her freedom to build the case in round two. Those data above can be summarized as follow:

Table 4.1 Types of Face Threatening Act performed by debaters

| **Types of Face Threatening Act performed by debaters** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **No** | **Addressee's negative face** | **Addressee's positive face** | **Addresser's negative face** | **Addresser's positive face** |
| 1 | Threatening/ warning | Accusing | Expressing thanks | Agreeing |
| 2 | Suggesting | Insulting | | Self humiliating |
| 3 | Ordering | Disagreeing | | Apologizing |
| 4 | Asking to stop doing activity | Criticizing | | Complimenting |
| 5 | Annoying | | | |
| 6 | Imposing | | | |
| Frequency | 23 times | 41 times | 3 times | 18 times |

Table 4.2 Types of Politeness strategy

| **Types of Politeness strategy** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **No** | **Positive politeness strategy** | **Negative politeness strategy** |
| 1 | Agreeing | Exclamation: please |
| 2 | Complimenting | Asking for permission |
| 3 | Giving reason | Conventional indirect |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | Noticing addressee's good deeds | Including both speaker and addressee in an activity |
| 5 | | Giving permission |
| Freq | 5 times | 8 times |