The role of linguistics studies on the political debate

Lee Collins
University College London, London, United Kingdom

Chang Jisum
University College London, London, United Kingdom

Abstract---The paper is to find out the linguistics role contribution towards the political debate event at the election party. The presidential debate's primary purpose is to sponsor and produce debates for the United States presidential and vice-presidential candidates and to undertake research and educational activities relating to the debates. A leaders' debate or presidential debate is a public debate held during a general election campaign, where the candidates expose their political opinions and public policy proposals, and criticism of them, to potential voters. They are normally broadcast live on radio, television and the internet. Increasing learners' confidence, poise, and self-esteem. Providing an engaging, active, learner-centered activity. Improving rigorous higher-order and critical thinking skills. Enhancing the ability to structure and organize thoughts.

Keywords---campaign, debate, election, linguistics, political.

Introduction

Hunt, Kim, Borgida & Chaiken (2010), United States presidential election debates, debates that occur between the main candidates for the American president, both before and after the primary elections. In policy debate, a disadvantage (abbreviated as DA, and sometimes referred to as Disad) is an argument that a team brings up against a policy action that is being considered. Examples of paradigms include Stock issues: In order for the affirmative team to win, their plan must retain all of the stock issues, which are Harms, Inherency, Solvency, Topicality, and Significance. For the negative to win, they only need to prove that the affirmative fails to meet one of the stock issues. In high school, all four constructive speeches are generally eight minutes long and all four rebuttal speeches are four or five minutes in length depending on the region; in college, they are nine and six minutes long respectively. All cross-examination periods are three minutes long in high school and in college (Mohan, 2002; Piketty, 1999).

Linguistic characteristics of the debate

While each candidate is to speak exactly the same amount of time, this does not say anything about the number of words they use. NS's total word count is higher than SR's, and the measure of his vocabulary, in terms of the number of forms used only once, shows a slightly richer lexicon (Kacprzyk, Wilbik & Zadrożny, 2008). His total speaking time is 3

min less than that of SR, which could either mean that he has a faster speech delivery than SR, or that he interrupts her more often (a fact that the clock does not take into account). It is well known that "men interrupt women more than they interrupt other men, far more than women interrupt men, and more than women interrupt other women" (Jones et al., 1999; see also Coates, 1993). It could also be an indicator of NS's aggressiveness towards SR (Monie`re, 1995). In any case, this appears as one of the objective markers of difference between the candidates' speech.

Discussion

In her seminal work, Language and Woman's Place, Lakoff (1975) presents features that could be specific to the language of women. Cutting across phonology, prosody, lexicon, and syntax, Lakoff observed that women's speech in English is characterized by hesitations. Women also tend to make more use of standard markers. Lakoff argued that this style is derived from a sense of inferiority.

Gender, discourse, and language

Since then, many linguists have considered the existence of a feminine speech style and have attempted to describe it. It has been argued that this style results from gendered culture and education; the difference theory put forward by Tannen suggests that women and men develop different styles of talking because, in fact, they are segregated during significant parts of their lives (Tannen, 1993). Learned gender differences are also strengthened by the representations that are associated with the feminine form in the grammar and lexicon of each language (Irigaray, 1990). Among many other languages, and unlike English, French distinguishes the grammatical gender of nouns in a way that indicates the gender of nouns – and especially of animates, whose gender is motivated by whether the noun subject is male or female. Such indications also are provided by pronouns, which may reveal different politeness and discursive strategies. An example of such strategies is lexical forms used as terms of address. Apart from terms of address reserved for men or women (Fracchiolla, 2006), there is a socially structured lexical distinction between the use of Madame and Mademoiselle which is parallel to the English Mrs and Miss.

Politeness is a structuring factor of language use, and the view that female discourse is more polite, as put forward in early feminist linguistics research (Lakoff, 1975; Brown & Levinson, 1987), has been reassessed in recent work (Christie, 2000; Watts, 2003; Mills, 2003; Talbot, 2010). There is a need to take into account the pragmatic and contextual dimensions of speech acts (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969; Duranti, 2008). This is illustrated by our corpus, which provides a counterpoint to the general claim that politeness is a female trait, as the male candidate makes notable use of politeness strategies. Such contextual strategies call for a situated analysis, which is further made necessary by cultural and historical evolution. Since World War II, gender equality has significantly improved in industrial societies. This change must inform current studies in their assessment of the relevance of gendered discourse.

Bulkeley (2005); Minteer & Miller (2011), the debate, gender acts more as an interpretative category than as a productive category. Though Se´gole`ne Royal (SR) is not adopting a gendered discourse, her discourse is nonetheless received as gendered. SR has a specific way of addressing people, and during the campaign her specific manner did reflect her project of change for French society. SR does not shy away from expressing her way of seeing things as her own and the emotions that go with it. Her style can be characterized by the concept of pragmatic empathy (Bonnafous, 2003; Perry, 2005; Ephratt, 2011), as defined by Perry, summarizing Bonnafous' definition, as involving:

"A firm, explicit rejection of Manichean or simplistic judgments; a very concrete mode of expression, not given to metaphor, rooted in daily life; the absence of irony or aggression towards one's opponents or detractors; frequent evidence of concern for and solidarity with one's potential audience; a call for grassroots action and active citizenship, coupled with reference to 'life' or even 'real-life'" (Perry, 2005).

Royal's concerns were often termed in a nurturing, motherly style that has been attacked by some as inappropriate. These traits are not feminine in themselves, yet they are interpreted as illustrating a feminine type of speech, and this is disfavoured in the political realm (Lithgow, 2000; Gidengil & Everitt, 2003). Arenas of power discourage the expression of feelings and emotions, which is perceived as a sign of weakness. This is incompatible with power since weakness would indicate incompetence (Fahey, 2007), as would passivity (Lithgow, 2000). Interestingly, it was frequently alleged, during and after the presidential campaign, that Royal was incompetent.

One example is a comment from a close ally of Sarkozy, then-defense Minister Miche`le Alliot-Marie: "Se´gole`ne Royal changes ideas as often as she changes skirts", a sexist statement also refers to the centuries-old French saying attributed to King Francis I: "Souvent femme varie, bien fol est qui s'y fie" meaning he who relies on a woman for even temperament is quite mad—a statement that quite often, and without justification, reproduces the stereotype of female irrationality. This, I feel, is especially gendered, and I hypothesize that claims of incompetence stem from Royal's departure from the conventional masculine political discourse by referring to her feelings and emotions. Other criticisms focused on her clothing, behavior, language and a number of her actions. In this paper, we focus on the differences between the candidates' speech styles. Raffirmsheremotionsandbeliefsandspeaks openly about what she wants; NS stresses the actions he will take – in keeping with the ethos already projected in previous televised debates (Kerbrat-Orecchioni & De Chanay (2007); Amossy (1999); Goffman (1973).

Kacprzyk & Yager (1984); Boeckx & Piattelli-Palmarini (2005), for each dimension, I show the exploitations of popular stereotypes associated with women and conventionally feminized speech styles (such as hysteria, weakness, politeness, and talkativeness) by the male candidate to serve his electoral purpose. Stereotypes of women are also resorted to by SR, as we shall see below. I analyze the debate and examine it against the background of established cultural and linguistic expectations. 3. Analysis of the debate

Most conversations are governed by certain rules known to the interlocutors. If the rules are not followed, interlocutors may be excluded from the conversation (*e.g.*, if a politician during an interview continually interrupts the interviewer or other speakers, he/she may have his/her microphone shut off). We learn these rules from our family, community, and society. These rules are influenced by our cultural background and by the location where the conversation takes place. A courtroom conversation, called a 'hearing,' has a different organizational flow from a restaurant conversation (Schegloff, 1991, 1993).

Applying different names to conversations based on the location implies the significance of 'place.' Conversation settings influence different turn-taking rules (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). As Schegloff (1991) puts it, "It is the courtroom-ness of courtrooms in session [that] seems in fact to organize the way in which the talk is distributed among [the] persons present, among the categories of persons present, in the physical setting."

In news interviews, the sequence of turn-taking is specified ad hoc. Initially, an interviewer's (IR) question is followed by the interviewee's (IE) response; in this case, the roles of the speakers are clearly divided. The interviewer is in a position to ask questions, while the interviewee answers and does not ask questions in return. At this point, the interviewee may not interrupt the interviewer. According to Heritage & Greatbatch (1991), the interviewee may ask for permission to butt in, but he/she never does so without

posting a request first. The interviewer, on the other hand, is obliged not to make any encouraging or discouraging statements in order to maintain objectivity.

Thus, we obtain a set of adjacency pairs in news interviews, "where we can assume that, in general, the answerer was the person to whom the question was addressed and that the answerer is addressing the questioner" (Wilson & Zeitlyn, 1995). While addressing the question, the interviewee cannot avoid using personal pronouns. A choice is made, whether it is to identify oneself (admitting that "I said so..." or "I did so...," etc.) or to identify with a certain group.

Our research focuses on the issue of that choice. This paper is interested in the changeable meaning of 'we' in interviews with American politicians. For example, we examine how politicians juggle their identification with a particular group by using the personal pronoun 'we'. What influences the shift between different 'we'?

Within the CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis) movement, there are two main research approaches that deal with context. Johnson's (1994) analysis exemplifies these approaches via two related issues: "(1) The question of what counts as relevant context; and (2) the dynamic and strategic nature of contextualization processes."

According to her findings, many approaches focus principally upon context within the discourse itself; they demonstrate how "context is attended to and constituted as a dynamic phenomenon within the turn" (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1992). Alternately, a large number of approaches study the effects of external experiences and context upon the conversation itself; they examine what participants bring to the discourse prior to its occurrence.

We know that the interview's environment (venue) and topic influence the distribution of the interviewees' pronouns (Givon, 1976; Wilson & Zeitlyn, 1995). The interview topic is widely considered as the main factor influencing the flow of conversation. Based on our research, we propose the opposite – that the impact of a venue is more significant than that of the topic itself. van Dijk (2002) also demonstrates that topic holds less importance than venue in political discourse. He lists categories that may influence political conversation, *i.e.* overall domain (*i.e.* politics), overall societal action (legislation), current interaction (political debate) and current setting (time, location). He further argues that neither topic nor style wholly categorize political discourse. Emphasis lies with (a) who is speaking to whom; (b) when the conversation transpires, and (c) the particular conversational goals (van Dijk, 1997, 2002). We emphasize the impact of location and purpose (interview or political debate) upon political discourse.

Heritage & Greatbatch (1991) explain, in their research, certain features of the common interview: (1) turn-taking is organized and (2) any interruption is not welcomed. One can also identify these features, along with divergent ones, in political debate.

Proctor Lily & Su (2011); Tencalla (2006), this paper highlights three main differences, upon which the following paragraph focuses. The first difference concerns turn-taking methodology. With regards to interviews, turn-taking is a natural result of questions asked to politicians by interviewers. In the 2008 vice-presidential debate, however, turn-taking was determined by the flipping of a coin. The second difference relates to interview question banks and how these banks are employed. There may be different questions for different politicians, and the interviewer is not obliged to ask exactly the same question to each politician interviewed. However, in the vice-presidential debate, the speakers had exactly the same question to answer, and they had the same amount of time for the response. These rules were very unique to the vice-presidential debate analyzed in this study.

The third difference involves the role of the interviewer. In debates, this role is ascribed to a moderator. A moderator resembles an interviewer, but serves more like a guard – he/she makes sure that all the rules are observed and that the candidates address the questions properly.

Kacprzyk & Zadrożny (2005); Fedrizzi & Kacprzyk (1988), most experts in examining the relationship between linguistics and philosophy always place philosophy in a prestigious position. This is not strange considering philosophy is the spirit of all sciences including linguistics. Even if the first language study was done by philosophers and not by linguists. In ancient times, philosophers solved various kinds of philosophical problems through a language analysis approach. For example, philosophical problems involving fundamental philosophical questions such as those, reality, existence, sensi substance, material, forms of causality, the meaning of statements and their verification (Katsoff, 1989) and other fundamental questions can be explained using language data analysis. This tradition is referred to by historians of philosophy as Analytic Philosophy, which developed in Europe, especially in England in the twentieth century.

All philosophers agree that there is a very close relationship between philosophy and language especially relating to the central role of philosophy as an analyst of concepts. The concepts analyzed by philosophy have a strong body because they are in the form of language terms and, therefore, cannot but, philosophers must understand the meaning of "what is language" which is always used in understanding these concepts (Ogiela & Ogiela, 2012); Kacprzyk & Fedrizzi, 1989).

Since ancient Greece, the Phusis has emerged which states that language is natural (fisei or physical), that is, language has a relationship with origins, sources in eternal principles and cannot be replaced outside of humans themselves and therefore cannot rejected. Thus in language there is a link between words and nature. These natural figures include Cratylus in the Pluto Dialogue.

This naturalist understanding was opposed by the Thesis which argues that language is convention (nomos). Language is obtained from the results of tradition, custom in the form of tacit agreement (silent agreement). Language is not God's gift, but is conventional. This opinion is represented by Hermoganes in the Pluto Dialogue (Kaelan, 1998).

Pesina & Solonchak (2015); Newmeyer (2014), the speculative dichotomy about the nature of fusie and nomos languages was the focus of philosophers' attention at the time. Likewise, the dichotomy of analogies and anomalies is a fundamental philosophical discourse considering that language is the main tool in philosophy, especially in logic. The analogy of the groups of Plato and Aristotle says that nature has an order as well as human beings that are reflected in language. Therefore language has regularity and is organized regularly. On the contrary, the Anomalists argue that language has no order. They show evidence of everyday reality why there are words that are synonyms, and homonyms, why there are elements of words that are neutral, and if the language is universal, the chaos should be fixed. In this sense language is essentially natural (Parera 2008).

Differences in perspectives about language and all related matters but remain within the umbrella of language, which was done by philosophers turned out to have such a large contribution to the progress of linguistics (Kravchenko, 2006); Kacprzyk & Zadrożny, 2016). These differences lead to discussion, dialogue, and even debate. It is this discussion, dialogue and debate that injects fresh blood into philosophers to always give birth to innovations and revisions to old theories concerning language. Starting with the emergence of philosophical language by philosophers, namely knowledge and inquiry with reason about the nature of language, cause, origin and law (which later became the

embryo of linguistic or linguistic birth) then linguistics or linguistics were born. that we know today.

Essence of linguistics

The ancient Greeks and other ancient people had the gift of wanting to know things that others considered as they should. Boldly and persistently, they made speculations about the definition, origin, history and structure of language. Our traditional knowledge of languages is largely due to them (Bloomfield, 1995).

This desire can be seen from what was conveyed by Herodotus, who wrote in the fifth century BC, he wrote that King Psammetichus in Egypt had exiled two newborn babies in a park, to find out which nation and the oldest languages in the world. When the babies start talking, they say the word bekos, which turns out to be from the Phrygia language which means "bread" (Yule, 1985).

Research like King Psammetichus gave birth to some new knowledge about language, which sometimes led to debate. For King Psammetichus, based on the results of his research he found that it turns out that the nation and the oldest languages were the Phrygia and language. But for other ancient researchers is not necessarily the case. King James IV of Scotland 1500 AD based on the results of similar research mentions that the Hebrew language as the oldest language in the world (Yule, 1985).

King Psammetichus and and King James IV did not have a close kinship because that was not possible. The two kings lived in two different eras and in different regions. Psammetichus lived in Greece and lived before Christ while James IV lived in the United Kingdom long after Christ. What makes them the same is that these two figures are known to have a strong interest in the mysteries of language. This interest arises as a result of the strong influence of philosophy on which they live.

Some definitions of language were created from the ideas and research of these ancient philosophers. Most of these philosophers agree that language is a sign system. It is said that humans live in signs that cover all aspects of human life, such as buildings, medicine, health, geography, and so on (Kallio & Häkli, 2011; Arroyo, 2000). Another definition of language as stated by Plato through Socrates: "Language is a statement of the mind of a person through the onomata and rhemata which is a reflection of one's ideas in the flow of air through the mouth".

The Nature of Linguistics
In his Cratylus dialogue, Plato discusses the origin of words, and in particular the question of whether the relationship of words with the object they are referring to is natural or is only an agreement. That dialogue gives us the first glimpse into a century-long dispute between Analogists and Anomalis (Bloomfield, 1995).

However intense the debate between the two camps, the thoughts that emerge about language made the philosophers aware that the forms of language change in the course of time. Slowly but surely, they finally find the true nature of language that is reflected through its forms and changes. Below are some of the nature of language that has been discovered by philosophers. Actually there are a lot of the nature of language that has been found, but the authors limit it to five.

(a) Language as a system

This nature has actually been believed by followers of anomalist understanding, but this nature became clear after the Sofis in the 5th century formulated systematically the language empirically. One of the leaders of the Sophists was Pitagoras. He

distinguishes the types of sentences above: narration, questions, answers, commands, reports, prayers and invitations (Parera, 1991).

Plato also emphasized the systematic system of language by giving different words in Onoma and Rhema. Onoma can mean names or nouns, and subjects. Rhema can mean phrases, verbs, and predicate. Onoma and Rhema are members of logos which means sentence or phrase or clause (Parera, 1991).

The idea that language has a system is also supported by Aristotle. In line with his predecessor Plato, he still distinguishes two classes namely Onoma and Rhema, but he adds another one called Syndesmoi. Syndesmoi is then classified as "connecting particles". More words serve in syntactic relations. Aristotle always departed from logic. It provides understanding, definition, and meaning from the point of view of logic.

In addition to distinguishing Onoma, Rhema, and Syndesmoi, Aristotle also distinguishes the sex of the word (Gender). He distinguishes three sex words over masculine, feminine and neuter or neutral. He also acknowledged that rhema also showed tense or time, ie Rhema could indicate whether the work was completed, not finished and so on (Parera, 1991).

The belief that language is a system is believed to be true to this day, especially by linguists. Many schools that essentially analyze systems in a language have emerged and enriched linguistic diversity.

(b) Language as a symbol

Eaerns Cassirer, a scholar and a philosopher said that humans are symbolic creatures. There are almost no activities that can not be separated from symbols or symbols. Including verbal communication tools called language. Language units such as words are symbols or symbols (Chaer, 2007). If the idea or concept to declare death is a black flag (in the form of a sign), and the idea or concept of the Godhead is symbolized by a picture of a star (in the form of a picture), then the symbols of language are manifested in the form of sounds, in the form of language units, such as words or a combination of words that are arbitrary. In Indonesian, a four-legged animal that can be driven is symbolized by the sound of [horse], in English it is written by horse and in Dutch it is written by paard.

(c) Language is sound

The nature of language as sound is carefully peeled by the Stoics. The Stoics were a group of philosophers or logics who developed at the beginning of the 4th century BC. Their contribution is quite large in analyzing language, even though they have not been separated from the view of logic.

These people talk about meaningful forms of language by distinguishing three main aspects of language, namely (1) a sign or symbol called semainon, and this is the sound or material of language (2) meaning, or what is called the lecture and (3) things external things called objects or situations or what are called pragmas (Parera, 1991).

These people have a very high interest in sound or phone, and they distinguish between legeins, namely speech sounds that may be part of the phonology of a language but are not meaningful, and propheretai or speech sounds that have meaning.

(d) Language is meaningful

A systematic study of the concept of "language is meaningful" was also carried out by the Stoics. In the field of lekta, or meaning, they have a different view from the analysis of Aristotelian logic which is less systematic and often absurd in meaning. Aristotle only recognizes the onoma and onomata. All changes from onoma in accordance with its function are not recognized. He called it just a case. This is due to the basic logic of Aristotle and his syllogism which only uses the letters A, B, and C and do not use the onoma forms practically in the example. The Stoics say that even Onoma's cases are in accordance with their functions. Then they differentiate between nominative - genetive - dative - accusative cases and so on. The same thing applies to Rhema. Although Aristotle had distinguished the rhema in tense, he still talked about something incomplete. The Stoics in this case distinguish rhema and categorization, which in our current understanding has a finite and infinite meaning (Parera, 1991).

(e) Language is universal

The Modists are medieval philosophers who paid great attention to grammar. They are called so because of their famous words by the fashionable De Sicnficandi (Parera, 1991). And they repeated the old conflict between Physics and Nomos, between Analogy and Anomaly. They accept the concept of Analogy because according to them language is regular and universal (Parera, 1991).

The universality of languages can be proven by the existence of the same characteristics and characteristics possessed by the languages in the world. Because language is in the form of speech, the universal characteristic of the language most commonly encountered is that the languages of the world have common language sounds consisting of consonants and vowels. That a sentence in the languages of the world is composed of words that have certain functions and roles. These similarities and traits are then known as the universality of language.

The role of philosophy in developing linguistics

Gomez (2009); Ogiela & Ogiela (2012), the age of the study of language is old. Starting from ancient Greece to modern times. Every period the development of language studies, philosophy plays a significant role. In the beginning, it was philosophers who studied language and provided definitions, categories, distinguishing types, forms and properties, and other differences. After linguistics is able to stand on its own into a solid field of science, the role of philosophy is still deeply rooted. Fracchiolla (2011); Starcevic (2006), although it is no longer a philosopher who studies language because it has been taken over by a linguist, the philosophical dimensions are still strongly embedded in it. This is caused by the persistence of the belief in philosophy of language as the spirit of linguistics in discovering new linguistic theories by linguists.

Conclusion

Debate is an activity of arguing between two or more parties that are individual or group in discussing and deciding problems and differences. Debate is a discussion or exchange of opinions on a matter by giving each other reasons to defend each other's opinions. In individuals, debates have benefits: Increase the ability to respond to a problem (rebuttal) because there is a process of mutually maintaining opinions between the two parties. Train to be critical of all theories that have been given. Master the topic or problem. Read and master as much data, facts, literature about the topic being debated. Confident, calm, loud! Don't look nervous or nervous. If you seem nervous, then that will make the debate opponent feel "superior". Control emotions. Debate is not "fighting neck muscles".

The purpose of a formal debate is to provide an opportunity for two teams of speakers to be able to express to the listener with a number of arguments that support or that will refute a proposal. Understanding the debate in the opinion of some experts. Debate is essentially an argument between individuals or between groups of people, with the aim of achieving victory. The definition of debate is mutual argumentation between individuals or between groups of people, with the aim of achieving victory by one party. An interest group or advocacy group or lobby group is an association (can be in the form of a non-governmental organization) whose aim is to influence political decisions, trying to convince public officials to act in accordance with the voice or interests of their group members. State interests are the needs owned by the state for society personal political interests are needs that are used for political activities themselves.

We must prioritize the public interest rather than the individual. because the common interest is a form of interest that surrounds the people. while the interests of our individuals can be resolved later. Because in the Deliberation, all suggestions from all people are stacked and then sought the best. Deliberation must prioritize the common interests rather than individuals because by mutual agreement each problem will be resolved quickly without anyone else feeling objections, because it is a joint decision.

References

Amossy, R. (1999). *Self-images in speech: The construction of the ethos* . Delachaux and Niestlé.

Arroyo, J. B. (2000). Mire usted Sr. González... Personal deixis in Spanish political-electoral debate. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *32*(1), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00040-5

Austin, B. J., Heine, V., & Sham, L. J. (1962). General theory of pseudopotentials. *Physical Review*, *127*(1), 276.

Bloomfield, B. P., & Danieli, A. (1995). The role of management consultants in the development of information technology: the indissoluble nature of socio-political and technical skills. *Journal of management studies*, *32*(1), 23-46. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1995.tb00644.x

Boeckx, C., & Piattelli-Palmarini, M. (2005). Language as a natural object–linguistics as a natural science. *The linguistic review*, *22*(2-4), 447-466. https://doi.org/10.1515/tlir.2005.22.2-4.447

Bonnafous, S. (2003). "Politician": a gender issue ?. *Networks* , (4), 119-145.

Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.

Bulkeley, H. (2005). Reconfiguring environmental governance: Towards a politics of scales and networks. *Political geography*, *24*(8), 875-902. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2005.07.002

Chaer, G. M., & Tótola, M. R. (2007). Impacto do manejo de resíduos orgânicos durante a reforma de plantios de eucalipto sobre indicadores de qualidade do solo. *Embrapa Agrobiologia-Artigo em periódico indexado (ALICE)*.

Christie, C. (2000). *Gender and language: Towards a feminist pragmatics*. Capstone.

Coates, K., & Harris, M. (1995). The human immunodeficiency virus type 1 Nef protein functions as a protein kinase C substrate in vitro. *Journal of general virology*, *76*(4), 837-844.

Constantin de Chanay, H., & Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (2007). 100 minutes pour convaincre: l'éthos en action de Nicolas Sarkozy. *M. Broth et al*, 309-329.

Duranti, A. (Ed.). (2008). *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. John Wiley & Sons.

Ephratt, M. (2011). Linguistic, paralinguistic and extralinguistic speech and silence. *Journal of pragmatics*, *43*(9), 2286-2307. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.03.006

Fahey, B. J., Nelson, R. C., Bradway, D. P., Hsu, S. J., Dumont, D. M., & Trahey, G. E. (2007). In vivo visualization of abdominal malignancies with acoustic radiation force elastography. *Physics in Medicine & Biology*, *53*(1), 279.

Fedrizzi, M., & Kacprzyk, J. (1988). An interactive multi-user decision support system for consensus reaching processes using fuzzy logic with linguistic quantifiers. *Decision Support Systems*, *4*(3), 313-327. https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-9236(88)90019-X

Fracchiolla, B. (2011). Politeness as a strategy of attack in a gendered political debate—The Royal–Sarkozy debate. *Journal of pragmatics*, *43*(10), 2480-2488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.02.006

Gidengil, E., & Everitt, J. (2003). Talking tough: Gender and reported speech in campaign news coverage. *Political communication*, *20*(3), 209-232. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584600390218869

Givón, T. (1976). On the VS word order in Israeli Hebrew: Pragmatics and typological change. *Studies in modern Hebrew syntax and semantics: the transformational-generative approach. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company*.

Givón, T. (1976). Some constraints on Bantu causativization. *Syntax and semantics*, *6*, 325-351.

Givón, T., & Li, C. N. (1976). Topic, Pronoun and Grammatical Agreement in Subject and Topic.

Goffman, E. (1973). *Rollendistanz* .

Goffman, E. (1973). The staging of daily life. Volume 1. Self-presentation. *Paris: Midnight editions* .

Goffman, E., & Lindquist, NT (1973). *Asyle: Über die soziale Situation psychiatrischer Patienten und anderer Insassen* (p. 367). Frankfurt a. M .: Suhrkamp.

Gomez, M. C. (2009). Towards a new approach to the linguistic definition of euphemism. *Language Sciences*, *31*(6), 725-739. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2009.05.001

Goodwin, M. (1992). The changing local state. *Policy and Change in Thatcher's Britain*, 77-96.

Greatbatch, D. (1998). Conversation analysis: Neutralism in British news interviews. *Approaches to Media Discourse. Oxford: Blackwell*, 163-185.

Hunt, C. V., Kim, A., Borgida, E., & Chaiken, S. (2010). Revisiting the self-interest versus values debate: The role of temporal perspective. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(6), 1155-1158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.05.004

Irigaray, L. (1990). Women's Exile: Interview with Luce Irigaray. *trans. Couze Venn. In The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader, ed. Deborah Cameron*, 80-96.

Irigaray, L., & Martin, A. (1990). Culture of Difference. In *Pli* (Vol. 3, No. 1, p. 44).

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., Holubec, E. J., & Holubec, E. J. (1994). *The new circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom and school*. ASCD.

Jones, M. R., Moynihan, H., MacKenzie, N., & Puente, J. (2002). Temporal aspects of stimulus-driven attending in dynamic arrays. *Psychological science*, *13*(4), 313-319.

Kacprzyk, J., & Fedrizzi, M. (1989). A 'human-consistent'degree of consensus based on fuzzy login with linguistic quantifiers. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, *18*(3), 275-290. https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-4896(89)90035-8

Kacprzyk, J., & Yager, R. R. (1984). "Softer" optimization and control models via fuzzy linguistic quantifiers. *Information Sciences*, *34*(2), 157-178. https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0255(84)90022-7

Kacprzyk, J., & Zadrożny, S. (2005). Linguistic database summaries and their protoforms: towards natural language based knowledge discovery tools. *Information Sciences*, *173*(4), 281-304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2005.03.002

Kacprzyk, J., & Zadrożny, S. (2016). Linguistic summarization of the contents of Web server logs via the Ordered Weighted Averaging (OWA) operators. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, *285*, 182-198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2015.07.020

Kacprzyk, J., Wilbik, A., & Zadrożny, S. (2008). Linguistic summarization of time series using a fuzzy quantifier driven aggregation. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, *159*(12), 1485-1499. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2008.01.025

Kaelan, M. S. (1998). Filsafat Bahasa. *Yogyakarta: Penerbit Paradigma*.

Kallio, K. P., & Häkli, J. (2011). Tracing children's politics. *Political geography*, *30*(2), 99-109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2011.01.006

Katsoff, D., & Check, J. H. (1997). A challenge to the concept that the use of calcium channel blockers causes reversible male infertility. *Human reproduction (Oxford, England)*, *12*(7), 1480-1482. https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/12.7.1480

Kravchenko, A. (2006). Cognitive linguistics, biology of cognition and biosemiotics: Bridging the gaps. *Language sciences*, *28*(1), 51-75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2005.02.002

Lakoff, G., & Thompson, H. (1975, September). Introducing cognitive grammar. In *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (Vol. 1, pp. 295-313).

Lithgow, J. K., Wilkinson, A., Hardman, A., Rodelas, B., Wisniewski-Dyé, F., Williams, P., & Downie, J. A. (2000). The regulatory locus cinRI in Rhizobium leguminosarum controls a network of quorum-sensing loci. *Molecular microbiology*, *37*(1), 81-97. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2958.2000.01960.x

Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness* (Vol. 17). Cambridge University Press.

Minteer, B. A., & Miller, T. R. (2011). The New Conservation Debate: ethical foundations, strategic trade-offs, and policy opportunities. *Biological Conservation*, *144*(3), 945-947. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2010.07.027

Mohan, G. (2002). The disappointments of civil society: the politics of NGO intervention in northern Ghana. *Political Geography*, *21*(1), 125-154. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298(01)00072-5

Monie, G. D. (1995). The problems faced by Indian ports today. *Maritime Policy and Management*, *22*(3), 235-238. https://doi.org/10.1080/03088839500000060

Newmeyer, F. J. (2014). *Linguistic theory in America*. Elsevier.

Ogiela, M. R., & Ogiela, U. (2012). DNA-like linguistic secret sharing for strategic information systems. *International Journal of Information Management*, *32*(2), 175-181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2011.11.016

Ogiela, M. R., & Ogiela, U. (2012). Linguistic protocols for secure information management and sharing. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, *63*(2), 564-572. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2011.10.038

Parera, C. A., & Cantliffe, D. J. (1991). Improved germination and modified imbibition of shrunken-2 sweet corn by seed disinfection and solid matrix priming. *Journal of the American society for Horticultural Science*, *116*(6), 942-945. https://doi.org/10.21273/JASHS.116.6.942

Perry, A. L., Low, P. J., Ellis, J. R., & Reynolds, J. D. (2005). Climate change and distribution shifts in marine fishes. *science*, *308*(5730), 1912-1915. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1111322

Pesina, S., & Solonchak, T. (2015). Concept in Cognitive Linguistics and Biocognitive Science. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *192*, 587-592. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.100

Piketty, T. (1999). The information-aggregation approach to political institutions. *European Economic Review*, *43*(4-6), 791-800. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0014-2921(98)00094-4

Proctor, K., Lily, I., & Su, W. (2011). The 1st person plural in political discourse—American politicians in interviews and in a debate. *Journal of pragmatics*, *43*(13), 3251-3266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.06.010

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*, *150*, 171.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. *Talk and social structure*, 44-70.

Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on language and social interaction*, *26*(1), 99-128. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi2601_5

Searle, J. R., & Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626). Cambridge university press.

Starcevic, V. (2006). Somatoform disorders and DSM-V: Conceptual and political issues in the debate. *Psychosomatics*, *47*(4), 277-281. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psy.47.4.277

Talbot, 2010).

Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1993). *Framing in discourse*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Tannen, D. (Ed.). (1993). *Gender and conversational interaction*. Oxford University Press.

Tencalla, F. (2006). Science, politics, and the GM debate in Europe. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*, *44*(1), 43-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2005.04.011

Van Bekkum, O. F., & Van Dijk, G. (1997). Agricultural co-operatives in the European Union-Trends and issues on the eve of the 21st century.

van Dijk, D. D., Osborn, D. D., & Sensier, M. M. (2002). *Changes in variability of the business cycle in the G7 countries* (No. EI 2002-28).

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Opinions and ideologies in the press.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, A. J., & Zeitlyn, D. (1995). The distribution of person-referring expressions in natural conversation. *Research on language and social interaction*, *28*(1), 61-92. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi2801_2

Yule, S. H., & Burnell, A. C. (1985). *Hobson-Jobson a Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-indian, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical and Discuisive*. Routledge Kegan Paul.

Zeitlyn, D., & Wilson, A. J. (1995). The Childes Project: an anthropological resource. *CAM*, *7*(1), 1-3. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1525822X950070010101