

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ  
КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ

Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології  
імені професора Г. Г. Почепцова

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики  
на тему:

«АНГЛІЙСЬКИЙ МОВЛЕННЄВИЙ ЕТИКЕТ ПУБЛІЧНОГО  
МОВЛЕННЯ (ЛІНГВОКОГНІТИВНИЙ І КОМУНІКАТИВНО-  
ПРАГМАТИЧНИЙ АСПЕКТИ)»

Студентки групи МЛа 53-18  
факультету германської філології  
Освітньо-професійної програми  
Сучасні філологічні студії (англійська  
мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика  
та перекладознавство  
за спеціальністю 035 філологія  
**Лук'яненко Анни Володимирівни**

Допущений до захисту  
« \_\_\_\_ » \_\_\_\_\_ року

Науковий керівник:  
кандидат педагогічних наук,  
доцент **Соколець Ірина Іллівна**

*В.о. завідувача кафедри  
германської і фіно-угорської  
філології  
імені професора Г. Г. Почепцова*

Національна шкала \_\_\_\_\_  
Кількість балів \_\_\_\_\_  
Оцінка ЄКТС \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
(підпис)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(ПІБ)

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE**  
**KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY**  
**Professor G.G.Pocheptsov Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology**

**Master's Qualification Paper**

**ENGLISH SPEECH ETIQUETTE OF PUBLIC SPEAKING**  
**(COGNITIVE, COMMUNICATIVE AND PRAGMATIC ASPECTS)**

**ANNA LUKIANENKO**

Group MLa 53-18

Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. **I. I. SOKOLETS**

PhD (Pedagogics)

Kyiv 2019

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
 <b>CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND FOR STUDYING SPEECH ETIQUETTE</b>	
1.1. Theoretical approaches to speech etiquette studying.....	8
1.2. Speech etiquette as form of polite verbal interaction .....	10
1.3. Speech etiquette as component of communicative behavior.....	22
Conclusions to Chapter 1.....	28
 <b>CHAPTER 2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: ITS TYPES AND FORMS</b>	
2.1. Public communication as speech genre .....	29
2.2. Public speech as form of public speaking.....	37
Conclusions to Chapter 2.....	43
 <b>CHAPTER 3. STRATEGIES AND TACTICS OF PUBLIC SPEAKING</b>	
3.1. Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies .....	44
3.2. Etiquette Speech Acts in English Public Speaking.....	56
Conclusions to Chapter 3.....	71
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	72
RESUME.....	74
REFERENCE LITERATURE.....	76
LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS.....	82

## INTRODUCTION

Modern anthropocentric linguistics, placing at the center of its study linguistic personality with all its inherent linguocognitive competence, opened a wide space for new objects of study and allowed a new look at traditional, long-established linguistic languages and concepts whose history often goes back to ancient times. In turn, the communicative-pragmatic approach, as the main methodological tool of the anthropocentric paradigm, makes it possible to clarify more carefully the lingual nature of linguistic units at different levels, to more fully reveal their pragmatic potential and functionality in different speech communicative acts. Thanks to this approach, the rules and principles of verbal interaction of communicating people were defined. These are, in particular, the maxims of cooperation proposed by P. Grice, the observance of which must ensure logical coherence and successful completion of communication, and the principles of politeness formulated by G. Leech.

Speech etiquette being a component of communication is the subject of constant attention by rhetoricians, philosophers, linguists, ethnographers, and other scholars.

A special place in modern linguistics is the problem of analysis of speech etiquette in the context of communicative-discursive paradigm. Researchers highlight various aspects of this concept, including linguocultural, sociocultural, syntactic-stylistic, lexicographic and pragmatic. However, the current state of linguistic science makes it possible to describe speech etiquette from updated linguistic and communicative-pragmatic positions.

The focus of linguistic studies on the key issues of the effectiveness of verbal communication increases the interest of experts in the study of speech etiquette in different types of discourse: scientific, dialogical, mass media, virtual, artistic and public. Due to the general focus of linguistic research of the 21st century on the consideration of the problems and preconditions of interpersonal communication in the context of globalization processes taking place in the world,

there is a need for a more thorough study of modern English public discourse, which led to the choice of the topic.

Verbal interaction consists not only of the implementation of specific communicative intentions, but also of their adequate speech and language transmission, therefore the analysis of speech etiquette in linguocognitive, communicative and pragmatic aspects should be taken into account.

**The purpose** of the paper is to examine the linguocognitive and communicative-pragmatic nature of speech etiquette in the English public sphere of communication.

Achieving this purpose involves the following **specific tasks**:

- to clarify the theoretical foundations of the study of the phenomenon of speech etiquette;
- to characterize speech etiquette as a linguistic and instrumental tool for the implementation of communicative strategies of politeness;
- to define linguistic means expressing polite speech behavior in public speeches;
- to define linguopragmatic means of expression of speech etiquette in modern English public discourse;
- to find out the communicative and pragmatic nature of speech etiquette in modern English public discourse.

**The object** of the study is etiquette English public speaking and its features.

**The subject** of the study is linguocognitive and functional-pragmatic means of expressing etiquette speech acts in modern English public discourse.

**The study material** was videos of public speeches on various topics, presented on YouTube ([www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com)), and scripts of public speeches from different sites ([aaspeechesdb.oscars.org](http://aaspeechesdb.oscars.org), [www.ted.com](http://www.ted.com), [time.com](http://time.com), [www.washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com)).

**Research methods.** Common scientific methods were used in the paper: systematization, generalization, description and comparison.

**The scientific novelty** of the obtained results is that the work clarifies the concept of speech etiquette as a structural component of normative speech behavior, the communicative purpose of which is display of politeness in a particular communication situation.

The main linguopragmatic means of expression of speech etiquette in modern English public discourse have been revealed, which are: declarative, directive, expressive etiquette speech acts, etiquette speech acts with discursive markers *please*; conditional and subjunctive etiquette speech acts.

Typical linguopragmatic characteristics of public discourse have been identified: ritualised, stereotyped, etiquette.

Speech etiquette is described as a means of implementing global and local strategies of politeness: positive politeness (strategies of exaggeration of interest, attention, demonstration of exaggerated curiosity, gift giving, promotion of optimism, seeking agreement), and negative politeness (manifestation of pessimism, apology, minimization of the degree of intervention, appealing to the norm, formal respect); the reasons and motives for their use are explained.

**The practical significance** of the obtained results is the possibility of using the basic theses and conclusions of the work in teaching normative courses of rhetoric, theoretical stylistics of the English language, grammar and lexicology of the English language, in the development of special courses in pragmatics, rhetoric and discourse.

**The work consists of** an Introduction, three Chapters, General Conclusions, Resume, Reference Literature and List of Illustration Materials.

Introduction substantiates the choice of the research topic and its relevance, determines the purpose and objectives, object and subject of exploration and methods of its analysis.

Chapter 1 discusses the main theoretical approaches to the study of speech etiquette as a common language category and analyses speech etiquette as a structural component of communicative behavior of speakers.

Chapter 2 deals with public communication, public speaking and its types. It also concerns public speech as a form of public speaking and its characteristics.

Chapter 3 is devoted to the politeness strategies and typical linguopragmatic characteristics of public discourse. It analyses the realization of the polite linguistic behavior in such etiquette speech acts as greeting, farewell, apology, gratitude, wishes, congratulations and request.

The General Conclusions outline the theoretical and practical results of the scientific research. The work is completed with reference literature, it contains list of illustration materials.

## **CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND FOR STUDYING SPEECH ETIQUETTE**

### **1.1. Theoretical approaches to speech etiquette studying**

Verbal communication as a special type of human activity and psycholinguistic mechanisms of its practical implementation have always been of interest to scientists. This question has not lost its relevance at the present time. Representatives of various sciences, in particular neuro-linguists, psycholinguists, pragmalinguists, are becoming more and more deeply involved in the processes that organize, activate and control a person's mental and speech behaviour. The modern anthropocentric language paradigm, focusing scientists on lively speech communication and the mental processes that accompany it, has opened up wide scope for their comprehensive study. As a result, a new scientific problem of linguistic research was formed, the deep essence of which remains largely unclear (Ворожбитова 2005: 243).

Speech etiquette is analysed by scientists as a cultural phenomenon that relates to a number of human feelings and emotions, behavioural ritual gestures that enrich and complement verbal interaction.

The role of speech etiquette in society has acquired great importance, due to its history and social evolution, functioning in society, versatility, various types and forms of implementation.

Therefore, speech etiquette can be considered as a specific form of interpersonal contact and as a historically established system of linguistic and cultural norms of social interaction of people in verbal and non-verbal relationships.

In order to adequately assess the linguo-pragmatic essence of the phenomenon of speech etiquette as a general language category, to show the features of its functioning in the English language, it is necessary to reveal the general meaning of the concept of "speech etiquette" in modern linguistics.



Speech etiquette as a subject of scientific analysis began to actively attract the attention of linguists from the second half of the 20th century and still remains relevant for scientific research because of its rich semantic palette in human communication in general and in intercultural particulars. The issue of speech etiquette and its various aspects are analysed from the point of view of the communicative-discursive paradigm by many scientists.

Scientists consider speech etiquette, focusing on various aspects of this linguistic concept, in particular on linguistic cultural, sociocultural, pragmatic, sociological, evolutionary, lexicographical, etc. (Прохоров 2004: 137).

A significant number of works was devoted to the issue of speech etiquette by the famous Russian researcher N. I. Formanovska. The author proposed a detailed analysis of the concepts of communication. Speech etiquette politeness from different angles of view, compared the features of their functioning in English, English, Russian and other languages.

V.I. Karasik focused in his works on social and cultural factors influencing the development of speech etiquette, and highlighted in detail the reflection of social status through etiquette speech acts (Карасик 2004: 283).

Using the example of the Russian language, V. E. Goldin in his book "Speech and Etiquette" presented a review of the actual use of etiquette speech formulas and set out practical recommendations for their use in society (Бенвенист 1974: 175).

T. B. Tsivyan studies the relationship between language and etiquette at the functional level, believing that there are certain rules for the ritualized speech behaviour of a person in society, which reflect significant biological categories (Бенвенист 1974: 183).

Ya. K. Radevich-Vinnitsky explores the concept of speech etiquette as a whole, considering its morphological aspects, motives and functioning in the Ukrainian language, as well as ways of situational use of etiquette speech acts (Бенвенист 1974: 186).

Scientists analysed the issues of speech etiquette from the point of view of the communicative behaviour of participants of verbal interaction based on Russian, Serbian and Slavic languages.

General and pragmatic characteristics of etiquette speech genres in the framework of speech acts, linguo-pragmatics and cognitive linguistics highlighted speech etiquette as a sociocultural phenomenon in the Kalmyk and Russian languages.

Features of the functioning of speech etiquette in various linguistic cultures using materials from Karachay-Balkar, Russian and English languages were studied in the scientific work of A. Kh. Chaushev.

In many scientific works, speech etiquette is considered as a concrete manifestation of a certain communicative thematic group, for example, a complaint, appeal, praise, flattery, a compliment, request (Кубрякова 2004: 82). So, I. A. Emelyanova studied the complaint, I. V. Dorofeeva provided a comprehensive description of the structural and functional features of appeal from the position of systemically linguistic and active pragmatic approaches (Кубрякова 2004: 85). L. E. Bezmenova illustrated the study of compliments, their functionally semantic and pragmatic features in modern English public discourse. An analysis of its relationship with the universal moral and ethical category of politeness is highly important.

## **1.2. Speech etiquette as form of polite verbal interaction**

Scientists from different times and schools have long proved that verbal communication is an important typological attribute of each person as a social individual (Виноградов 1996: 132). The ancient philosopher Aristotle devoted a whole work of verbal interaction as one of the key components of human activity. In the well-known work “Rhetoric”, the author considered the process of verbal communication to have three main principles of argumentation – “logos”, “ethos”

and “pathos”, on the basis of which fundamental approaches to building communication in traditional rhetoric were later formed (Rhys 1954: 35).

The concept of “logos” (from the Greek. – word, thinking, utterance) Aristotle explained as such, which is associated with the verbal content of judgments and is a linguistic component of oratory. This term is used by the speaker in relation to rational thinking, the core of which is the use of appropriate and accurate verbal means (Rhys 1954: 41). According to modern concepts, this concept is interpreted as a linguo-cognitive process of combining knowledge and ideas, various ways of constructing conclusions and reasoning (Грайс 1985: 219).

“Pathos” (from the Greek – passion, inspiration) was illuminated by Aristotle as a pragmatic component, the main purpose of which is caused by certain emotions to the addressee of the message. The author noted that the most common ways of appealing to emotions are stories that are accompanied by vivid, emotionally rich speech with touching examples (Rhys 1954: 48). Therefore, “pathos” can be interpreted as the intention of the creator of the message to influence the listener, motivating him to action (Олянич 2007: 182).

The word “ethos” is etymologically associated with customs and moral concepts, and therefore with the concepts of morality and ethics.

In ancient philosophy, this term meant the character of a person; in rhetoric, it was compared with the reliability and veracity of the speaker’s information. Aristotle interpreted “ethos” as a stylistically marked part of communicative activity, characterized by the expediency of speech and its conformity with the expectations of listeners who can accept or reject what is communicated. In addition, the “ethos” is filled with a certain determination, namely, to convince the audience of the veracity of what was said. It was believed that the principle of ethics was correctly applied if it testifies the competence and reliability of the author, takes into account and respects the point of view and value system of the listener. In modern linguistic visions, “ethos” is associated with the norms and rules of speech behaviour and etiquette (Карасик 2004: 321).

The Aristotelian triad is the basis for the construction of any statement; it allows you to consider it from three angles of view: culturally logical, communicatively pragmatic and morally ethical. “Ethos” sets the general moral and ethical framework for communication, “pathos” defines the communicative goals and intentions of the speaker, and the “logos” describes and contributes to the implementation of the plan at the language level. The aforesaid can be reduced to one conclusion: the addressee uses certain verbal means with the help of a “logos” to actualize his “pathos” under the conditions of a given “ethos” (Михалева 2009: 116). All the above processes of verbal interaction make it a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, therefore, researchers interpret communication from various scientific positions. Some analyse this concept as a relatively independent category of interpersonal interaction, others interpret speech interaction through the prism of social interaction (Шейгал 2004: 127).

American sociolinguists consider the category of communication in a broad sense, believing that it is a “mechanism by which relations between people are formed and developed – all symbols of consciousness, together with the means of their transmission in space and preservation in time”. German researchers proposed significantly shorter interpretation and focused on the fact that communication implies community, belonging to an internal experience. Searle speaks about the internal experience of the participants in communication, and he understands this term as exchange of speech acts, the addressor and addressee of which have a common proportional content (Brown 1983: 43).

An interesting opinion on this subject is expressed by J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, who believe that during verbal interaction, the speaker through a speech message addresses the listener a certain meaning with which the said is associated.

P. Grice, S. Levinson, R. Lakoff, E. Hoffman, K. Kerbra-Orechioni and A.S. Issers analyse verbal communication as an ethical category and study it from the perspective of communicative strategies and tactics (Грайс 1985: 225).

From all the variety of interpretations of the deliberate concept, there are also points of view according to which “verbal communication” is determined by

extrapolating to all the basic characteristics of the category “activity” (Карасик 2000: 7).

Verbal interaction as a kind of human activity is interpreted by many scientists. According to I. Artyukhov, communication is a mechanism for joint activities, wordings and a collective subject, as well as a condition for the storage and dissemination of individual experience, passing it on to future generations, ensuring the transmission of public values (Арутюнова 1998: 137).

Russian linguist A.N. Leontyev, comparing the term “verbal communication” with the term “activity”, noted that if an activity is considered as a set of actions that obey the notion of a certain result that can be achieved as an end goal, then communication as a communicative activity is a set of goals that submit to a specific communicative goal (Олешков 2006: 123). A. N. Kazartseva develops this statement and calls human communication “a motivated living process of interaction between the participants in communication, aimed at implementing a specific life attitude, based on feedback in specific types of speech activity (Олешков 2006: 127). Interpretation of A. N. Leontiev and A. N. Kazartsev agree with similar considerations of K. K. Platonov. The researcher argues that this type of human interaction can be defined as an activity having a four-part structure, and purpose, motive and would result in (Олешков 2006: 134).

Ukrainian linguists correlate this communication with a process that unfolds sequentially, has a course in time, is carried out under the control of the participants’ consciousness, and therefore has all the signs of activity. In his interpretation, it is important that speech communication is primarily social interaction, since its interlocutors act not so much to exchange information, but to achieve another, non-speech goal, which may not be realized by the participants in speech interaction. Summarizing the various views on this issue, the authors submit a typology of acts of verbal interaction and offers to classify communication according to the following criteria: with the participation or non-participation of the language as a language code in the form of implementation; on the topic of communication; for the purpose of communication; by the number of

interlocutors; as far as officiality and the like. According to these criteria, the scientist branches this concept into: verbal, non-verbal; oral, written, printed; political, scientific, domestic, religious, philosophical, educational and pedagogical; business, entertainment; closed, open, mixed communication, etc. (РЫБАКОВА 1999: 13).

Despite various interpretations of the concept under discussion, researchers generally agree that verbal communication is a special form of human activity, during which, by communicating, individuals exchange voice messages that contain a specific goal and provide for the achievement of a result corresponding to it. This is a complex multifaceted phenomenon, the participants of which have a common internal content. This is what emphasizes the definitions of this concept in the "Brief Psychological Dictionary", summarizing various aspects of its study, interpreting communication as a complex multifaceted process of establishing and developing contacts between people, generated by the needs of joint activities and includes the exchange of information, the development of a unified strategy of interaction, perception and understanding of another person (АРУТЮНОВА 1998: 136).

In passing, we note that communication is not only a purely process of verbal interaction, because it is accompanied by various paraverbal components, such as gestures, facial expressions, distance, and the like. In addition, it reflects heterogeneous sociocultural factors in which this interaction takes place; background knowledge of communicants, which make out their communicative and cognitive base: their behaviour, knowledge of rules and etiquette, etc. These non-verbal components of a speech act play an extremely important role in its successful flow and effective completion. They complement and specify verbal meanings, give them communicative completeness. No less important in this sense is the role of the ethical component in the verbal interaction of the participants of communication.

"Dictionary of Ethics" defines etiquette as "a set of rules of conduct regarding the external manifestation of attitudes towards people (dealing with

others, forms of treatment and greetings, behaviour in public places, manners and clothes)" (Макаров 2003: 251). It is worth noting that both interpretations of the concept of "etiquette" are very general and do not reflect the etiquette of communication, is an integral component of the culture of verbal behaviour.

The basis of etiquette is made up of the rules of tone, which are considered the norms of linguistic and cultural behaviour of the speaker and come down to four qualities of the linguistic personality: instinctive decency, moral integrity, self-esteem and loyalty. Decency means not only the correctness of speech and behaviour, but also honesty and reliability in obligations. Moral integrity along with honesty includes grace of motives and justice in evaluating the motives of others. Self-esteem is manifested in the rejection of obligations that will not be fulfilled, and loyalty is expressed in fidelity not only to friends, but also to principles.

Etiquette reflects the content of certain principles of morality; it is a necessary regulator of human interaction. This is a dynamic phenomenon that is developing together with society. Thus, etiquette is explained as the order of behaviour established by society in this or that communicative situation. This term contains the manners of interpersonal interaction accepted in a certain environment and the corresponding ceremonial. It is due to the established requirements of a culture of behaviour, acquire the character of strict regulation (Сиротинина 2000: 33).

Manifestations of ethical behaviour are often superimposed on the emotional background of the interlocutors. So, it must be noted, "that etiquette standards produced in a certain linguistic and cultural environment include methods of their implementation that are part of the emotional aspect of human life, because each person has his own ways of conveying emotional shades" (Буюнова, Нечай 2006: 153).

Russian scientist V.I. Karasik interprets etiquette as a dynamic attribute of a person and defines etiquette behaviour as a super-individual characteristic of a person, his belonging to a certain part of society. In addition, the author notes that

etiquette is a system of formal behavioural acts, and considers etiquette rules to be identical with moral standards. In his opinion, one can violate etiquette by adhering to moral standards; you can violate moral standards by following etiquette; it is possible to violate moral norms and etiquette by not intentionally responding to the greeting of a familiar person (Карасик 2000: 6).

Moreover, etiquette as a moral category can be defined as a whole as a factor regulating behaviour in standard situations of subcultures of certain nations, but speech etiquette – as a complex system of units of a certain ethnic language used according to the rules of speech behaviour in standard situations of subcultures (Шейгал 2004: 215).

In the course of work, we will adhere to the point of view that speech etiquette is the use in a communicative act, according to linguistic and cultural rules and traditions of a particular linguistic community, specially made by the Uzus of language elements and stakes necessary for successful verbal interaction.

American researcher R. Lakoff characterizing etiquette statements as reflecting very subtle differences in the choice of a particular communication register, tradition, and norms of mutual respect. The author clarifies that etiquette designs are variable and reflect the sociocultural characteristics of the historical era. R. Lakoff sees in speech etiquette a social mechanism for avoiding conflicts in communication (Lucas 2001: 15). A similar opinion is shared by N.I. Formanovska, noting that speech etiquette is a wide zone of units of language and speech, “expresses etiquette of behaviour at the level of a word, gives language wealth, it has accumulated in every society to express a “non-conflict” attitude towards the interlocutor. In addition, the scientist believes that speech etiquette is “a microsystem of nationally specific verbal units adopted and prescribed by society to establish contact between interlocutors, maintain communication in the desired tone in accordance with the rules of speech behaviour” (Lucas 2001: 18).

Thus, through speech etiquette, the speaker declares his choice and to belong to a certain linguistic and cultural environment. Speech etiquette includes various means of communication "to identify socially significant differences in



communicative situations, establishing universal and nationally specific characteristics of etiquette behaviour..." (Виноградов 1996: 125).

N. I. Stelmakhovich, who claims that speech etiquette is "a national code of verbal decency", also speaks of the national aspect of this concept.

Russian experts in the field of communication A. Ya. Goikhman and T. M. Nadeina in the work of "speech communication" characterize etiquette forms as a ritual communication – the authors understand it as "customary or established order for communication". Since the ritual is a certain repeatability, it would be logical to associate this concept with stereotypicity, and therefore, speech etiquette is a stereotypical phenomenon, since we are talking about repeatedly repeating the same constructions in typical situations (Звегинцев 1976: 52).

F. S. Batsevich notes that "ethical speech norms are embodied in special etiquette speech formulas and are expressed by a combination of multilevel means – from individual words to utterances and even texts" (Звегинцев 1976: 62). So, due to repeated use, label designs are made out in the language of a separate society in the form of constant label statements, becoming like a language cliché.

Summarizing the above thoughts, we note that speech etiquette is a system of use in a communicative act, according to linguacultural rules and traditions of a particular linguistic community, specially produced by the language elements and codes necessary to establish and maintain contact between interlocutors in accordance with their social roles in official and informal circumstances.

Sustainable formulas of speech etiquette include communicative forms of treatment, greetings, farewells, apologies, thanks, congratulations, wishes, sympathy, approval and compliment, invitations, offers, requests, advice, etc. (Буянова, Нечай 2006: 143). These etiquette speech acts are reproduced in typical situations of interpersonal communication and are used by interlocutors to express polite and benevolent expressions of attitude.

Thus, speech etiquette is an important social and linguistic and cultural factor that regulates the nature of speech behaviour and contributes to the successful establishment of contact, mutual understanding and successful self-

presentation through various etiquette statements, because "the structure of speech etiquette constitutes an open system of tools that serve the needs of polite communication of people" (Виноградов 1996: 127).

Since the dominant role in expressing respect for people belongs to our speech, speech etiquette is an integral part of communicative interpersonal interaction.

So, this communication, depending on the circumstances of its deployment, is implemented in accordance with certain everyday functions of language units of various language levels and occurs in accordance with specific rules and norms of their verbal use.

Speech etiquette and language norm. Due to the dominant role of the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistic research, the issue of linguistic norm has acquired a new scientific sound, more and more attracting the attention of humanities, because it is present in any social environment "refers to the linguistic and cultural heritage represented in society at different stages of its development. The study of linguistic norms acts as one of those problems of linguistics, the debate around which has long gone beyond the scope of linguistic interpretation. The complexity of the definition of this concept is associated with the presence of two polar opposite characteristics. The first is related to the preservation of the traditional form of speech as a national-cultural heritage, the second is to ensure the development of the language as dynamic above in accordance with current and changing speech trends. Therefore, various positions are observed regarding the definition of the concept of the language norm "both within the framework of the theory of culture and only for practical reasons regarding language culture.

In the "Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary" edited by V. M. Yartseva, it is emphasized that the linguistic norm as "a combination of stable and unified linguistic means and rules for their use, are consciously fixed and cultivated by society, is a specific sign of the literary language of the national period" (Лингвистический Энциклопедический Словарь 1990).

An outstanding Czech linguist V. Matesius, who formulated the principle of “flexible stability,” expressed a slightly different opinion on the language norm. Penetration into the normative vocabulary of the language) and in diachrony (some norms go out of use, others go into active use) (Виноградов 1996: 129).

World-famous scientists L. Elmslv and E. Coseriu relate the concept of "norm" and "system" of language. So, L. Elmslv interpreted language as a structure that can be formalized. E. Coseriu, in turn, introduced the triad of “speech – norm – system” into linguistics, it was believed that there is a certain correlate of the system that responds not because “you can speak”, but because “it has already been said” or according to tradition “says "in society. According to the author, the norm contains historically implemented models.

The Ukrainian researcher L.V. Struganets, in his reasoning, combines the above interpretations of the language norm and identifies the complex of its differential features, namely: the correspondence of the linguistic (literary) norm to the language system, the combination of stability and dynamism, variability, stylistic differentiation and codification. In her opinion, only if all these parameters are counted, it is possible to adequately comprehend the real linguistic norm, is the basis for its objective codification (Шейгал 2004: 315).

According to G. I. Biryulin, the concept of correct, cultural, normative broadcasting includes certain ideas about the norm in terms of speech etiquette since speech etiquette is a system of stable norms of communication, the use or non-use of units of speech etiquette can be subject to rationing (БЕНВЕНИСТ 1974: 251).

Thus, the linguistic norm as one of the central terms of linguistics is associated with linguistic culture, the normative aspect of speech and the literary language (Виноградов 1996: 128). The language norm is interpreted as a social phenomenon, changes, develops and is characterized by variability and at the same time is a manifestation of the fixation of language forms. In addition, an understanding of normative, correct, cultural speech is closely related to speech etiquette. Consequently, a violation of the norms of the language can be interpreted

as a violation of the rules of speech etiquette, therefore its functioning directly depends on the existence of the language norm in a particular linguistic culture.

From the concept of a language norm, the concept of a communicative norm is closely intertwined. As already noted, compliance with the etiquette rules of communication and the appropriate use of politeness formulas contribute to the process of successful verbal interaction of speakers, but their absence leads to an unsuccessful deployment of a speech act, because communicative norms are violated.

Issues of observance of communicative norms in the process of verbal communication have always interested researchers (БЕНВЕНИСТ 1974: 315). As noted by A. P. Zakharova, the concept of “communicative norm” is determined by the rules that are enshrined in the public mind, they are poured onto the speech behaviour of interlocutors in various communicative situations. The author suggests studying the system of communicative norms in accordance with the types of speech culture and qualifying them as a generalizing version of language communication. Based on the development of types of speech culture, she identifies the following types of communicative norms: dialect (folk), vernacular, argot, middle literary and elite (КазакOVA 2012: 13).

Modern Russian researcher N. A. Lemyaskina connects the communicative norm with speech etiquette and notes that there is a problem of the coexistence of normal etiquette, limited by the framework of a particular society, and codified etiquette, which is used outside society for verbal interaction with carriers of other types of speech culture. At the same time, the use of neutral label designs is observed in different linguacultural. G. I. Biryulina, in turn, believes that this phenomenon is explained by stylistic differences in the use of units of speech etiquette, which are determined by the belonging of speech to different functional styles, each of which has its own set of etiquette rules. Business speech is characterized by a high degree of formality, scientific – by a rather complex system of etiquette requirements that determine the order of presentation of the material, etc. (Карасик 2000: 17).

Some scientists connect the concept of “communicative norm” with the concepts of “communicative ethos” and “cultural norm”, also speaks of the close connection of the communicative norm and speech etiquette. The author notes that language is both an integral part of culture and its vehicle, therefore, the concept of “communicative norm” includes the totality of knowledge, norms and communicative manners inherent in a particular language environment. In her opinion, the communicative ethos is due to the functioning of certain linguistic phenomena that reflect cultural norms and canons that exist in each individual linguistic. In this case, the communicative context and the overall proportional content of the replicas of the participants in speech interaction play an important role. Because “speakers have not only language, but also general communicative norms” (Звегинцев 1976: 217).

Widely known in the modern humanitarian environment, American scientists P. Brown and S. Levinson characterize the phenomenon of communicative ethos as such, it varies depending on the linguistic culture into which it fits, define it as a “symbol of the quality of speech interaction that characterizes groups or social categories of people in In some communities, ethos is friendly and warm, in others it is formal and respectful, and in others it is hostile and restrained” (Виноградов 1996: 130).

The Polish researcher G. Vežbycka also correlates the communicative norm of communication with the sociocultural rules of the hostel by communicating the subjects and considers it necessary to link the “cultural-specific norms of verbal interaction with the cultural”. S. Bloom-Kulka holds the same opinion, noting that “the linguistic style is part of the cultural ethos” (Карасик 2000: 9).

V.I. Vinogradov believes that compliance with the communicative norm depends on situationally, which forms a contextual frame for each verbal or nonverbal interaction. Unlike linguistic, systemic or stylistic norms, communicative norms are understood “as the adequacy of the communicative process of communication, as well as its conformity with the values, standards, and regulations existing in a given culture”. Therefore, for a communicative norm

(which is considered also situational) determining attitude to the communication process, because it is presented not only by linguistic, but also by non-linguistic components and is due to situational factors and circumstances (Виноградов 1996: 129).

According to many experts of the theory of verbal communication, such a chip, the communicative norm is closely related to the functional features of the language, the linguistic and cultural rules of the host of speakers, their communicative ethos and the specific situation of communication (Казакова 2012: 23). Possession of knowledge of the communicative norm in a particular sociolinguistic and cultural environment provides participants of verbal interaction with the opportunity to correctly organize their speech behaviour and, accordingly, achieve a successful result. So, the main parameters of the communicative norm are the observance of the established postulates of communication and ethical norms, which indicates that speech etiquette and the communicative norm are two closely interrelated phenomena of interpersonal verbal interaction, which varies depending on the functional style of each individual linguistic culture.

### **1.3. Speech etiquette as component of communicative behavior**

Society as a complex sociocultural formation functions in the form of an integral monolithic formation due to the fact that in it there are certain frameworks of behaviour for its members. As a result, society develops standardized rules, norms of social behaviour, which are mounted in a set of generally accepted principles etiquette interaction. According to I. A. Sternin, this type of interpersonal interaction includes specific components of communicative behaviour, such as national character, dominant features of communication of a linguistic and cultural community, verbal communicative behaviour, non-verbal communicative behaviour, national symbolism (ЗВЕГИНЦЕВ 1976: 269).

The famous Russian linguist N. I. Formanovska argues that speech etiquette can be considered in a narrow and broad sense.

In a narrow sense, according to the author, speech etiquette is the sum of situationally thematic unity of communicative units that function to establish, maintain and terminate speech contact with the interlocutor (appeal, greeting, farewell, apology, congratulations, etc.). Appealing to this interpretation, the researcher also considers speech etiquette as a structurally forming complex that enters into the functional-semantic field of politeness. Whereas, in a broad sense, speech etiquette is a socially defined and nationally determined rules of speech behaviour that frame the etiquette of any verbal communication (text). This determines the mechanism of social correlation of communicative interaction between interlocutors, as well as the mechanism of all social prohibitions on certain uses in a particular case (Ножин 1989: 201).

According to G. A. Gazizov, communicative behaviour is characterized by norms that allow it to be interpreted as normative or non-normative. In his opinion, normative communicative behaviour contains speech etiquette as its component, which is associated with stable communication formulas in standard etiquette situations and regulates the main methods of verbal and non-verbal interaction of interlocutors. In this regard, speech etiquette is a normative framework of communicative behaviour that defines the norms, rules and principles of etiquette communication. The norms of communicative behaviour are mainly characteristic of the entire linguistic-cultural community and quite definitely reflect and adopt etiquette rules associated with situations of speech etiquette. However, communicative behaviour is not limited only to the etiquette component, because, as noted by Yu. E. Prokhorov and I. A. Sternin, it contains topics of communication, perception of certain communicative actions by native speakers, features of verbal interaction in large communicative areas, and also describes not only polite, standard communication, but also real communicative practice (Олешков 2006: 112). Therefore, communicative behaviour is a concept much wider than etiquette speech interaction.

Speech etiquette as a linguacultural category is analysed by scientists as a means of verbalizing a polite attitude. Well-known researchers P. Brown, S.

Levinson believe that positive politeness is based on approach-based, and negative politeness is based on avoidance-based. The demonstration of solidarity and maintaining distance, according to the authors, are the essence of polite behaviour. Having a certain arsenal of communicative-pragmatic and sociocultural knowledge, the speaker shows his interlocutor his affection, while maintaining a certain distance, thus showing his respect for him, the interlocutors try to maintain a welcoming atmosphere of mutual understanding, therefore they resort to a strategy of positive politeness. At the same time, to demonstrate mutual communication, participants use negative politeness strategies. Thus, the politeness function is to maintain a balance between the demonstration of solidarity and the gratuitousness of relations (Brown 1983: 193).

From the point of view of supporters of this theory, speech politeness performs a communicative function and carries certain information.

Russian researcher T.V. Larina believes that rapprochement and distance can be called hyperstrategies of politeness used to achieve common communicative goals, each of which is implemented using a system of more specific strategies and tactics. According to the author, various types of strategies can be associated with various speech acts. Speech acts of positive courtesy, aimed at rapprochement of the interlocutors, can be correlated with expressive performative statements. Voice messages of negative politeness, the main purpose of which is to show respect for the personal space of the interlocutor, respectively, should be associated with incentive directive speech acts, according to which the speaker communicates with the interlocutor. M. Sifianu, characterizing these types of politeness, notes that negative politeness minimizes the politeness of impolite ilocuts, while positive politeness enhances the politeness of polite ilocuts (Кипкаева 2008: 192).

The same considerations are developed in studies of the politeness category by K. Kerbra-Orekkioni. Speaking of negative and positive politeness, K. Kerbra-Orekkuni remarks that there is “a huge amount of evidence when the interlocutors mitigate acts that threaten the interlocutor’s reputation and strengthen speech acts, approve of my opinion” (ЗВЕГИНЦЕВ 1976: 143).



An expression of positive politeness of the masses, for example, in such etiquette speech acts: greeting; wishes; Pole congratulations. The expression of negative politeness is realized, in particular, through etiquette speech constructions: requests; apologies.

The main contribution of K. Kerbra-Orechioni to the theory of politeness is that it analyses in detail the various levels of verbal and non-verbal behaviour in which cultural variations can be found. According to her vision, variability is realized at the behavioural verbal, paraverbal and nonverbal levels (Звегинцев 1976: 152).

Studying politeness as a pragmatic category, the signs of which, as a rule, appear only in context, it seems advisable to mention also the absolute politeness scale proposed by G. Leech, the relative politeness scale (Brown 1983: 156). Regarding the absolute scale of politeness, politely utterances can be defined out of context. The label speech act of politeness is undoubtedly appropriate to regard as respectful at the level of semantics of the statement. Along the way, the prosodic level of expression is also important, because if this request is made with rude intonation, it will automatically turn into impolite. According to the relative politeness scale, its degree is determined in the context - in accordance with the norms of communicative behaviour, that is, at the level of pragmatism.

Maxims of polite behaviour. The category of verbal politeness is also considered as a moral and ethical component of linguistic maxims (see, for example, Proceedings of P. Grice, R. Lakoff, G. Leech and others) (Brown 1983: 176). This scientific approach is based on the work of P. Grice *Logic and Conversation*, in which four basic postulates (maxims) of the communicative behaviour of participants in verbal interaction were formulated for the first time, in particular, to express clearly their opinion, be concise and appropriate, and choose an appropriate manner of communication (Грайс 1985: 229).

P. Grice does not consider that the list of maxims of verbal communication that he has proposed is exhaustive. The researcher suggests that, in addition to the above, other maxims of a moral, ethical, social nature are possible, such as the

maxim “be polite” (Грайс 1985: 238). It should be noted that the communication rules outlined by P. Grice are more suitable for business rather than everyday communication, as they are aimed at efficiency and information content and do not take into account the emotionally expressive aspect of speech interaction.

The well-known American researcher R. Lakoff, analysing the problem of communicative politeness, focused her attention on the pragmatic aspect of this category, as a factor, in the communicative behaviour of the speaker manifests itself in the implementation of certain goals (Олешков 2006: 83).

R. Lakoff calls these maxims the rules of pragmatic competence and believes that all the postulates of P. Grice can be included in her first rule. The author also notes that communication, completely subordinate to the postulates, would be boring and much formalized. So, in everyday communication, these rules are constantly violated or ignored. According to the second pragmatic rule, R. Lakoff branches it into games of the so-called maxim of politeness. With these three rules, the researcher associates various types of politeness, which she classifies into: "formal politeness" (Formal Politeness), to which the first rule applies; informal politeness "(Informal Politeness), in which the second rule applies; intimate politeness (Intimate Politeness), which can be attributed to the third rule, when the speaker uses various means to make the addressee feel that he is sympathetic. At the same time, R. Lakoff notes that in general all the rules are aimed at achieving a communicative goal, the only difference is that it is achieved in different ways (Олешков 2006: 92).

As we see the theory of maxims as a whole and their varieties in particular do not have an unambiguous interpretation in the scientific literature, moreover, their list, as noted by F.S. Batsevich, can be significantly supplemented (Нежин 1989: 115). Given the subject of our analysis, in the future we follow the opinion of G. Lakoff, who distinguishes the maxim of politeness as a separate linguo-pragmatic factor of a communicative act, to a greater or lesser extent present in functional pragmatics in all other maxims that regulate communication processes. For example, maxim of relations. According to the views of the Grice, this maxim

requires the communication participants make meaningful coherent communicative messages, consistent with what has been said, and which do not contradict the principle of cooperative interaction. According to this maxim, the rule of verbal etiquette requires that when meeting, we use verbal greeting formulas, and saying goodbye, and not vice versa. Similarly, we can explain the role of politeness in the implementation of other communicative strategies and tactics emitted by researchers.

## **Conclusions to Chapter 1**

1. Speech etiquette is a specific form of verbal communication, commonly used in a particular linguistic community. Its purpose is to regulate sociocultural and emotionally expressive relationships between people in different communication situations and thus to influence the effectiveness and success of their communication. Etiquette speech is carried out by means of a system of stable expressions and rules of their use, which have a ritualized character.

2. Speech etiquette is a structural-semantic component of the functional-semantic category of politeness and forms its conceptual core. The communicative category of politeness is a universal moral and ethical phenomenon that manifests itself in the level of manners and style of linguistic and non-linguistic behavior of communicating individuals. Politeness as a set of communicative norms and rules is affected by various verbal and non-verbal means.

3. Etiquette speech is a set of rules for the use of etiquette constructions in verbal interaction. Speech etiquette forms its normative framework and is a structural component of speech behavior of speakers. It defines the basic principles of etiquette communication and is an expression of polite attitude to the interlocutor.

## CHAPTER 2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: ITS TYPES AND FORMS

### 2.1. Public communication as speech genre

The growth of research interest in the problems of communication and information began to be observed in the second half of the 20th century. Nowadays, in philosophical and sociological literature there are hundreds of definitions of communication. Among them is the one that characterises communication as “a type of oral communication in the process of which socially significant information is transferred to a large number of listeners, as a result of which such information is given the status of publicity” (Уилби 2003). Exchanging of information and giving it public status is the goal of public communication. “Public status involves the transfer of information by a person with a certain social status, established officially or unconditionally recognised in the hierarchy of a social group” (Горелов, Седов 2001: 134).

In linguistic researches, the term “public communication” is connected with the term “speech genre” that has various interpretations. Currently, there is a large number of formulations of the genre, which in general can be divided into several groups.

*One group of definitions* is based on the classical definition of a genre and implies “differentiating genres into monologue, dialogue and polylogue” (Винокур 1990: 381). Although this definition lacks proper flexibility and dynamism, and “the genre is conceptualised either too narrow (for example, it is only applicable to poetry and other works of fiction or art) or, on the contrary, too broadly” (Деметьев 1997: 109).

*Other scientists* distinguish between “primary (inherent in the natural language) and secondary (compilation) genres of speech”. Moreover, secondary genres of speech mean genres of literature, science and journalism. “The fundamental importance of the concept of “speech genres” for the formulation of a general theory of communication is extremely great”. (Стрельникова 2005: 21).

The genres of public communication are derived genres in relation to the

genres of the everyday sphere of communication and they are called rhetorical (Greek rhetoric – the theory of eloquence). Public communication genres as rhetorical ones imply that the speaker has a certain art, knowledge and experience in the field of linguistic design of the statement according to the situation in which communication occurs between the speaker and the listener (knowledge of the norms of the literary language, compliance with ethical standards of verbal behavior and norms of cooperative communication). The wider the range of mastered speech genres, the higher the level of human communicative competence (Василик 2003: 549).

In general, public communication can be divided into educational, business and journalistic, each of which has its own set of genres with specific characteristics. The main linguistic characteristics of the genres of public communication are:

- deterministic, repetitive character, fixed in the genre forms;
- manifestation in socially significant communication situations related to the regulation of both verbal (the use of etiquette formulas; the use of language distance methods;
- the use of neutral or politically correct vocabulary, recommended for public use;
- the use of constructions that imply a general position or problem statement), and non-verbal behavior (appearance, communicative distance);
- the ready-made normative samples (frames).

In accordance with the above characteristics, public communication can be described as “typical speech behavior in standardised situations of social interaction” (Василик 2003: 349).

The status of publicity is also associated with the official atmosphere of communication, and is subject to specific regulations. The audience is informed about the topic of the speech, speaker’s status, time and place of the speech. (Василик 2003: 545).

The participatory audience is usually specially organized listeners, who came to listen to the speaker due to their social role. In turn, the speaker is informed about the number, age, professional affiliation, as well as any other information of this kind (Коноваленко 2014: 11). The necessary conditions for successful public communication are general motivation, awareness of the subject matter (apperception base, background knowledge), the same verbal and non-verbal means of communication.

The problem of communication with the audience is of paramount importance. The listeners are considered as equal participants in the communication process. It is directly related to the concept of communication efficiency. The success of communication is in direct proportion to the interaction of the speaker and the listener, and effectiveness is defined as “an indicator of the degree of correlation of the primary specific goal to the final result of the act of communication” (Василик 2003: 118).

The universal principles of effective communication (the principle of cooperation, communicative cooperation, principle of clarity in ideas, principle of appropriate language, principle of attention, etc.) were formulated by G. P. Grice. He argues that speakers intend to be cooperative when they talk. For Grice, cooperative means that the speaker knows that each utterance is a potential interference in the personal rights, autonomy and wishes of the other. That is why we have to shape our utterances in a certain way. Grice's cooperative principle is a set of norms that are expected in conversations. It consists of four maxims, we have to follow in order to be cooperative and understood:

- Maxim of quality: As speaker we have to tell the truth or something that is provable by adequate evidence.
- Maxim of quantity: We have to be as informative as required, we should not say more or less.
- Maxim of relation: Our response has to be relevant to the topic of discussion.
- Maxim of manner: We have to avoid ambiguity or obscurity; we should

be direct and straightforward.

Communication interference or communication barriers that inevitably arise in the process of communication can have a negative impact on the “process of implementing the interaction between the participants of communication and its effectiveness”, creating certain obstacles for the recipient to perceive information (Василик 2015).

If as a result of communication the communicative intention was realised, communication can be considered effective; partial realisation of communicative intention (receiving incomplete information by the addressee), we can talk about a communicative miss, and if a communicative intention is not realised – about a communicative failure (Василик 2015). Among the conditions for successful interaction in the communication process, which are based on a certain level of human relations and social interaction, the researchers identify: a desire to communicate or a communicative interest, a mood for the interlocutor’s world, the ability to realise and understand the communicative intention of the speaker; the speaker’s ability to change the language content of the information provided; taking into account extralinguistic factors (information transfer channel), emotional and physiological state; speaker competence in the field of etiquette; the ability of interlocutors to coordinate plans and patterns of behaviour in the process of motivated speech communication (Граудина, Ширяев 1999: 72).

The result of communication is understood by scholars as the “effect” of communication. V. B. Kashkin understands the significant effects of communication as “modification of the knowledge of the recipient of information, transformation of attitudes (relative to persistent representations of the individual)” (Кашкин 2000: 81). M. A. Vasilik considers that the results of communication is “pragmatic, emphatic, aesthetic effect, satisfaction of interest in knowledge, amplification of an individual’s position” (Василик 2003: 471).

One of the types of public communication is public speaking (an oral monological statement by one person (speaker) addressed directly to the audience present). Public speaking in the interpretation of K. A. Sünnenberg is a



“syntactically connected, logically designed and stylistically individualised expression by a person of his thoughts, feelings and desires, which he / she expresses on his / her behalf to the mass listener with the help of an oral living word, in order to infect the listener with his ideas so that he / she considers them his / her own and would be ready to put them into practice” (cit.: Попова 2005: 10).

Public speaking is also defined as “the most conventional and most personalised form of influence on the mass consciousness” (Красильникова 2005: 11). “Public speaking skills, oratory skills and specific techniques of eloquence, aesthetics and artistry” are decisive in a professionally oriented sphere of communication (Красильникова 2005: 11). Means of all language levels, including intonation, play an important role in realising the communicative intention of the addressor in public speaking. Correct intonation design of oral speech optimises its auditory perception, contributing to the achievement of the final result of communication.

Public speaking is the art of words usage in order to present information to the audience. There are several types of public speaking and each type requires different approaches and skills.

Demonstrative speaking requires speaking clearly to describe actions and to explain the process of performing those actions. The main goal of this type of public speaking is to make sure that audience leaves with the information and knowledge how to do something. The most popular types of demonstrative speaking are science demonstrations and role playing.

Ceremonial speaking requires special occasions. It is typical of weddings, graduations, funerals, birthday parties, etc. Most people give some kind of this speech during their lives. Ceremonial speech usually involves a toast and tends to be emotional and personal to people who hear it.

The aim of persuasive speaking is to convince the audience of a certain viewpoint. It is mostly used by politicians, lawyers and clergy members. For instance, politicians may persuade of voting for them, or in order to get support for

their projects. Lawyers are persuading a jury of their position, and clergy members are persuading people to win over to their faith. Persuasive speaking is characterised by a high-profile opening statement, evidence to show speaker's credibility and a conclusion that will enforce the audience to support one's position and even take an action. The persuasive speaker uses different voice intonations, emotional appeals and different expressive means, and stylistic devices. There are three types of persuasive speeches:

- Persuasive speeches of fact propose that the speaker's view is probably true. The speaker has an ethical responsibility to provide reliable, valid evidence to the audience, and to be aware of and avoid bias in the selection of the evidence;
- Persuasive speeches of value, that imply certain actions, but they are not a call to action. Persuasive speeches of value depend on a judgement that something is right or wrong, moral or immoral, or better or worse than another thing;
- Persuasive speeches of policy advocate change from the status quo, or the way things are today. The speaker wants the plan proposed by the speech to become policy.

Informative speaking involves explaining a concept or a specific topic to the audience. Typical speeches here are college lecture courses, industry conferences and public officials' information sharing. The main goal of this type of speaking is just to disseminate vital information, without trying to convince the audience to take a certain side.

Entertaining speaking is the most common in the modern society. The main aim of this type of speaking is to stir an audience's emotions by using interesting illustrations, hilarious stories, and just flat out humor. This speaking is usually short, witty and humorous. In broader terms, an entertaining speaking is designed to captivate the audience's attention and amuse them while delivering a message. Entertaining speaking is typical of special occasions, such as a toast at a wedding, an acceptance speech at an awards banquet, a motivational speech at a conference,

etc.

Oratorical speaking is used to preach virtue and appeal to common basic truths. This type of speaking is usually given on very special occasions like a graduation ceremony, inauguration or ribbon-cutting event. This speaking can take shape in two distinct forms, it can be long and quite formal in situations like funerals, graduations, and inaugurations, or it can be short and informal in situations like the speaking given during a toast in a special event. The best and most common example of the oratorical speaking is an inauguration speech.

Motivational speaking is aimed at motivating people, inspiring them and uplifting their self-esteem. The general self-improvement of the audience is the goal to be attained. This type of speaking is generally used in schools, when teachers try to encourage students to do better in order to improve their grades and overall records, in offices, when the boss is talking to his employees, trying to inspire them to put in more effort to get the job done, or during football matches, when the coach is trying to motivate his players to win and be crowned champions, etc.

Explanatory speaking is given to critically explain a situation or thing. It is somehow similar to the demonstrative speaking. The explanatory speaking provides a detailed step by step and breaks down of how to do something. There is no visual aid used to help in understanding. A good example of explanatory speaking is a food talk show, when the speaker explains the step by step procedures to make various dishes, or the witness explains how an event took place.

Debate speaking takes place when there are a lot of verbal exchanges being made by the two or more parties involved. Its aim is to justify an opinion on a certain matter. This act of debating takes shape in many forms in our modern society, such as classical, impromptu, parliamentary, mock trials, extemporaneous and even public forum. As the normal standard in general debate, all sides are given an equal amount of time to give a speech on why they think their opinion or view on a certain matter is the right one. A debater has to develop certain skills like

public speaking, researching, initiative skills, and even leadership skills.

Forensic speaking is mainly regarded as the practice and study of public speaking and debating. The reason why this type of speaking is called forensic is because of its strong similarities to the competitions at public forums during the time of ancient Greece. This event can take place in a simple classroom or in a more sophisticated setting like a national or international event. During the activity, students are advised to research and improve their speaking skills in order to learn other types of speaking (Lucas 2001: 68).

The art of public speaking is all embedded in one's understanding and mastery of the different types of speaking. Speaker also has to know general features of public speaking which include: consistency and consistency of speech; communicative orientation of the statement; thematic statements; oral form of communication; syntactic complexity; the use of a variety of verbal and non-verbal means of communication. There are several other characteristics of public speaking:

- Firstly, the topic should be useful, unique, interesting and familiar to the speaker, as well as it should concern the audience.
- Secondly, there must be the following structure of the speech itself – an introduction to explain the topic fascinatingly, a main body with more details about the subject, and a conclusion to summarize the data.
- Thirdly, the information should be organized in a clear, logical way, for example with the help of an outline for the speech. Speaker can list each point of the topic and establish means to proceed from one to the other.
- Finally, public speaking employs relevant examples with smooth transitions and a conversational tone of delivery. Speaker should use oral or visual aids that help the audience in understanding main points and keep its attention. Thus, public will not lose track of the speech.

## 2.2. Public speech as form of public speaking

Public speech is a special form of speech activity in direct contact, speech delivered to a specific audience and addressed to a specific addressee, it is oratorical speech.

Public speech is being studied today in two directions: rhetoric and linguistics of the text, which allow to more fully illuminate both the rhetorical and linguistic features of public communication. From the point of view of the linguistics of the text, public speech is considered as a text that is the result of discursive activity. “It is a special result of the process of speech and, in this sense, a completed work born of discourse” (Кубрякова 2004: 516). Public speech implies all differential attributes of the text: “thematic, structural and communicative unity” (Красных 2001). Basic text categories are laid down and programmed in public speech at the level of the primary author’s intention, and are realised by the speaker during public speaking (Блох, Фрейдина 2011: 64).

There are six elements of public speech: the subject of the speech action is the speaker (speaker); the object is the mass listener (audience); the action is the utterance; the instrument of action is the verbal living word; the mode of action is syntactic, logical and stylistic; the pragmatic purpose of the speech, which defines its linguistic design and distinguishes three principles of oratory style, theme, speech design and oratory intent (Попова 2005: 10).

Public speech is delivered in order to inform listeners and have the desired impact on them: to convince them, to inspire them, to call for some activities, etc. Public speech in form and content is a monologue speech, designed for passive perception by listeners, and not always implies a verbal response on their part. Considering public speaking from a socio-psychological point of view, we can say that this is not just a monologue of a speaker in front of the participants, but this is a complex multifaceted process of communicating with those present, moreover, a process involving an implicit dialogue.

The speech interaction between the speaker and the listeners refers to the “subject-subjective” relationship, because both sides are active participants in joint

activities, and each of them plays the role assigned to them in this complex multilayer process of public communication.

Speaking to the public, the speaker, often defending his point of view and proving his / her correctness, resorts to persuasion as a method of influencing listeners in the process of communication (Jaffe 2010: 89).

It should be noted that to prove something and to persuade are two different processes that are closely connected. To prove means to confirm the truth of a situation with facts or arguments, and to convince means, through intellectual influence on the consciousness of the listeners, to reinforce in them the idea that the thesis is true, to make like-minded people share the speaker's point of view and accept it.

In order to convince the audience, logical and psychological techniques are used.

Logical techniques are addressed to the minds of the listeners. These include: theoretical generalisations and conclusions, already proven laws of science, axioms and postulates, definitions of the basic concepts of a particular field of knowledge, facts, statistics, etc.

Psychological techniques affect the feelings of listeners. If a speaker arouses certain feelings among the audience with his speech, then his / her speech will undoubtedly have a great impact on the audience, and the listeners will remember it better. The process of persuasion is strongly influenced by the internal emotional and psychological state of the listener, his/her subjective attitude to the subject of speech. Psychological techniques can affect various feelings, helping to achieve the desired result. For example, they turn to a sense of honor and duty, try to arouse sympathy, reach agreement, condemn, to shed a grain of mistrust, doubt, etc. Rhetorical ethics forbids the speaker to resort to the use of feelings, as well as emotions that can lead to various conflicts (anger, envy, aggressiveness, etc.).

Public speech is delivered in a specific audience, so the speaker must carefully prepare for the upcoming speech. He / she should clearly imagine in what audience he / she will speak, take into account the psychological state and mood of

his / her listeners. All this will allow him / her to better prepare for a speech and achieve success in communicating with the audience.

Among the main characteristics of the audience are:

- homogeneity (heterogeneity) of the audience (determined by their socio-demographic characteristics of the audience: gender, age, nationality, education, professional interests, life experience, etc.);

- the quantitative composition of the listeners (listeners' behaviour and their reaction in a large and small audience are different);

- the emotional mood of the audience (arises under the influence of such psychological mechanisms as infection – an unconscious repetition of the actions of others; imitation – the conscious reproduction of other people's behavior patterns; conformism – the influence of majority behavior on an individual person);

- the motive of the listeners. Currently, psychologists distinguish three groups of motives that encourage people to attend and listen to public speeches: intellectual-cognitive motives (listeners are interested in the topic of the speech, so they want to expand their circle of knowledge on this issue and get answers to their questions); motives of a moral and ethical nature (listeners must be present at this event in order to avoid any troubles); motives of an emotional and aesthetic nature (listeners are personally acquainted with the speaker, so his / her performances give them pleasure to listen to them, etc.).

The message material should be adapted to the specific audience for which the speech is intended. Mutual understanding between the rhetorician and the listeners arises when both sides are engaged in joint mental activity, i.e. when they care about discussing the same issues, solving the same problems (intellectual empathy) and at the same time they experience similar feelings and experiences (emotional empathy).

Methods of presenting the material to the audience consist of the following aspects: 1) achievement of mutual understanding; 2) attracting and maintaining the attention of students; 3) adaptation to the level of understanding of the audience; 4)

strengthening or changing the attitude of the audience to the speaker or subject of his speech (Вердербер 2003: 233).

The main indicator of mutual understanding between the speaker and the audience is the expected reaction to the speaker's speech, external expression of attention from the audience, working silence in the audience, natural and confident behavior of the speaker (Вердербер 2003: 233).

Various factors influence the communication between the speaker and the audience. First of all, it is the relevance of the issue under discussion, the novelty in covering the selected topic, the attention-grabbing content of the speech. It is these factors that to a certain extent determine the success of public speech (Вердербер 2003: 233).

The speaker and the audience are united by common experiences (Let us recall with you the events of days past and those joyful feelings that gripped us all when we found out ...).

The audience's interest in many respects depends on the relation of the stated information personally to the listeners, therefore, to maintain the audience's interest, the information must meet a number of requirements, in particular, it must be timely (can be used immediately in practical activities), close (relate to personal space a person, his "territory"), serious (include issues relevant to the audience) and lively (contain vivid examples, illustrations, stories, cases affecting the feelings of the audience).

The success of the speaker's speech is assessed mainly by the positive attitude of the audience towards him – the speaker and his position should be accepted by it, therefore, the speaker must like the audience, create a favorable impression about himself / herself, i.e. increase the level of trust that the audience has for him (Введенская 2014: 189).

The speaker needs to demonstrate to the audience his knowledge and experience on the issues covered, therefore he / she should be well prepared for the presentation, should show the audience that he / she has a sufficient supply of



material on this topic which is directly related to the subject of communication (Введенская 2014: 189).

Any good public speech will draw from seven basic categories of resources available to the speaker to persuade an audience:

- maxims – a short, pithy statement expressing a general truth or rule of conduct that is commonly accepted by culture and used to justify a variety of beliefs and actions;
- facts – a condensed empirical claim that tells us about some facet of the world that we can rely upon to be true;
- statistics – they do not deal with specific assertions about concrete objects but are mathematical generalizations that help us make predictions about certain types of objects or events; they do not tell us what something is but rather what we can probably expect of it;
- testimony – consists of direct quotations from individuals who can speak with some authority on a certain state of affairs;
- examples – include descriptions of actual or hypothetical events, people, objects, or processes that can embody an idea or argument in a concrete form so that audiences can “see” what it means;
- narratives – a dramatic story that is more complex than an example, and that captures and holds the attention of an audience by promising that, through the unfolding of the plot and character, something new and satisfying will be produced at the end;
- topics – a way of relating things together.

Gathering together material from each of these categories will provide a wealth of resources from which to draw upon to construct a public speech that is complex and powerful.

The speaker in front of the audience, must remember that, no matter how interesting his speech, the attention of the audience dulls over time and they stop listening, so the speaker needs to know various techniques of managing the audience and use them skillfully in the communication process. Now we will

consider strategies and tactics, verbal and non-verbal means of speech etiquette, used by speakers in their public speeches.

## **Conclusions to Chapter 2**

1. Public communication is a type of communication in the process of which socially significant information is transferred to a large number of listeners, as a result such information is given the status of publicity.

2. Public speaking is a syntactically connected, logically designed and stylistically individualised expression by a person of his thoughts, feelings and desires, which he/she expresses on his/her behalf to the mass listener with the help of an oral living word, in order to infect the listener with his ideas so that he/she considers them his/her own and would be ready to put them into practice.

3. Public speech is a special form of speech activity in direct contact, speech delivered to a specific audience and addressed to a specific addressee, it is oratorical speech. Public speech is delivered in order to inform listeners and have the desired impact on them: to convince them, to inspire them, to call for some activities, etc. Public speech in form and content is a monologue speech, designed for passive perception by listeners, and not always implies a verbal response on their part.

## CHAPTER 3. STRATEGIES AND TACTICS OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

### 3.1 Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies

During verbal interaction between the communicants, not only the exchange of information takes place, but also the demonstration of their attitude to each other. Due to this fact, the researchers single out transactional communication, oriented mainly on the transaction of information, and interactional communication, aimed at creation and maintenance of interpersonal contact.

To achieve the desired effect communicants employ politeness strategies and appropriate speech etiquette units.

The linguistic and cultural concept of "politeness" is closely linked to the aesthetic and cultural aspect of human interaction. The literal meaning of the verb "to polish" is related to the aesthetic appearance. First, it is a rough and imperfect material, which later, with the help of grinding, turns into something smooth and pleasant to touch and to see. So does a polite person who "grinds" and refines his or her behavior. To support this view, one should refer to Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary that interprets the term "politeness" as a set of customs and rules, governing speech and behavior, and the manifestation of the best human qualities in society (Лингвистический Энциклопедический словарь 1990). At the communicative-pragmatic level, this is done through the use of positive and negative politeness strategies, through which the speaker can exert a communicative influence on the interlocutor and fulfill a certain purpose and intention.

In public speech positive politeness strategies (strategies of convergence) are realised by means of exaggerated curiosity, approval, sympathy to the interlocutor; by paying attention to the addressee, his interests, desires; by demonstrating curiosity towards the addressee; by gift giving to the addressee; by promoting optimism in relationships and seeking agreement.

Negative politeness strategies (strategies of distance) are realised by implicit speech acts; by minimizing the degree of intervention; by pessimism manifestation; by formal respect; by apology and appealing to the norm.

The realization of positive politeness strategies by the speaker is intended to demonstrate friendly and courteous attitude to the listener and to reduce communication distances in order to strengthen both the speaker's and the listener's images.

The Strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval, sympathy to the interlocutor is based on the fact that the addressee is trying to transfer to the interlocutor the idea, that his desire is to maximize sympathy and to make the interlocutor understand it. A leading aspect of this strategy is the emotional content of the addressee's attitude towards the addressee. The perlocutive effect of this strategy is that the speaker seeks to convey to the listener his positive attitude.

At the linguistic level, the strategy of curiosity, approval, sympathy to the interlocutor is realized in using hyperbole, repetition, intensifiers, expressive adjectives and verbs.

Intensifiers, or so-called markers of intensification, can be the following: *a lot, infinitely, very much, so, such, so much, so many, great, absolutely, really, quite, totally*. For example: "*I look out here and, you know, I see my life before my eyes: my old friends, my new friends. And really, this is such a great honor, but the thing that counts the most with me is the friendships and the love and the sheer joy we have shared making movies together*" (Meryl Streep Academy Awards Acceptance Speech).

This strategy is widely used in official sphere, public sphere including, with its emotionally expressive lexemes: "*And today, I especially want to recognize all these — extraordinary leadership team that was behind Reach Higher from day one.*" (Michelle Obama)

Exaggeration as the politeness strategy is widely used in many communication situations, for instance, in such etiquette speech acts as greeting, farewell, apology and gratitude, etc. For example:

*"It's a great honor for me to be here today to join the women's refugee commission, to celebrate these exemplary leaders of refugee, these people whose bravery is humbling, inspiring, galvanising."* (Meryl Streep: Touching Speech & Dramatic Reading)

*"Well, we are beyond thrilled to have you all here to celebrate the 2017 National School Counselor of the Year, as well as all of our State Counselors of the Year. These are the fine women, and a few good men — one good man — who are on this stage, and they represent schools from across this country. "* (Michelle Obama)

*"And there were many, many, many powerful performances this year that did exactly that, breathhtaking, passionate work."* (Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes)

The examples above show, that exaggeration is realized by intensifiers, which strengthen the semantics of the verb ("are beyond thrilled"), of the noun ("*a great honor, exemplary leaders, breathtaking, passionate work*"), and of the adjective ("*bravery is humbling, inspiring, galvanising*"). There is also an example of repetition ("*many, many, many powerful performances*"), which shows approval of the speaker. The combination of these lexical and syntactic means (hyperbole and repetition) ensures high expressivity and hyperbolicity of etiquette speech, the pragmatic function of which is to show attention to the interlocutor, to emphasize interest to him, to express communicative support and sympathy.

The strategy of paying attention to the addressee, his interests, desires (pay attention to the interests of interlocutor, his desires and needs) is on the first place of all positive politeness strategies by P. Brown and S. Levinson. Positive attitude to the interlocutor and understanding of his preferences give attention to those characteristics of addressee, which, according to the speaker, addressee wanted to pay attention to. This strategy can be formulated as follows: pay attention and give attention to the others. Key pragmatic component of this strategy is to say something pleasant to the interlocutor and to show curiosity towards him.

Display of regard towards the addressee is one of the features of English language, which is represented in its lexical system. It can be confirmed by the presence in English vocabulary of synonymous series of adjectives with meaning "attentive to someone", such as *attentive, careful, thoughtful, considerate, mindful, watchful*, and with meaning "caring" such as *kind, kind-hearted, warmhearted, tender, concerned, attentive, thoughtful, solicitous, altruistic, considerate, affectionate, loving, doting, fond, sympathetic, understanding, compassionate, feeling*.

Constant demonstration of attention to the addressee is the peculiarity of English communicative behavior. It is manifested in the etiquette speech acts of greeting, farewell, apology and gratitude, etc.

For example, while formulating greeting, the speaker says "*Please sit down*", which is an external feature of attention to the addressee. On the pragmatic level this invitation is not only the demonstration of respect, but also a sign of recognition of the importance of the interlocutor, a way of showing attention towards him, for example, as it is in this situation: *Good evening! Please sit down. Please sit down. Thank you. I love you all.* (Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes) This example shows how Meryl Streep implements the strategy of paying attention to the addressee with the help of the etiquette speech acts of greeting and gratitude. It should be noted, that the actress repeats her invitation to seat two times to make sure everybody hears it and follows her request. Thus, the speaker gives her attention to the audience and its needs. This action shows the actress's communicative flexibility and a positive mindset towards all the communicants.

The strategy of demonstrating the curiosity towards the addressee (demonstrate the curiosity towards the interlocutor) is focused on the idea that the speaker tries to show his positive attitude towards the addressee, as well as interest in him. This strategy is similar to the strategy of paying attention to the addressee, his interests and desires. These strategies, alongside with the strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval, sympathy to the interlocutor, belong to three

major convergence strategies. The strategy of demonstrating the curiosity towards the addressee is realized in the situation when the speaker shows interest to the interlocutor, and is manifested in different situations of greeting, apology, gratitude, compliment, wishes and congratulations, etc.

For example: "And the beautiful Ruth Negga was born in Ethiopia, raised in Ireland, I do believe. And she's here nominated for playing a small town girl from Virginia. Ryan Gosling, like all the nicest people, is Canadian. And Dev Patel was born in Kenya, raised in London, is here for playing an Indian, raised in Tasmania." (Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes)

We can see that the speaker expresses his admiration for the personalities of addressees and glorifies them. It shows the interest of the speaker towards the listener. In this case, the strategy of demonstrating the curiosity towards the addressee helps to strengthen the image of the interlocutor and to make a nice impression on him.

The strategy of gift giving to the addressee (give gifts to the addressee – sympathy, understanding and cooperation) combines all the strategies above. The meaning of this strategy is in the idea, that replicas with the help of which the speaker shows attention or exaggerates curiosity are communicative gifts. It promotes realization of positive politeness hyperstrategy aimed at pleasing the interlocutor: «*I want you to feel good*» (Буянова, Нечай 2006:167). This strategy includes nonverbal communication components, such as smile, gentle look and handshake. At the speech level these are the speech acts of understanding, compassion and cooperation. For example: And today, I especially want to recognize all these — extraordinary leadership team that was behind Reach Higher from day one. And this isn't on the script so they don't know this. I want to take time to personally acknowledge a couple of people. (Michelle Obama).

This fragment is interesting because there are speech acts of sympathy and cooperation aimed at showing respect towards the addressees, and also there is a phrase («*this isn't on the script*») that shows that the speaker wanted to please the addressees by secretly acknowledging them. Thereafter, communicatively gifting



the interlocutor, the speaker meets his need to be understood at most. It helps to create favorable ground for mutual understanding/rapport.

The strategy of promoting optimism in relationships (be optimistic to the addressee) is quite popular in English linguoculture. This strategy is realized in asking the questions about state of affairs and state of health (*How are you? How is it going?*), which are more likely to be statements to say hello, and joking with the audience. For example: "*When they called my name I had this feeling I could hear half of America going \"Oh no! Oh, c'mon why? Her? Again?\" You know? But, whatever.*" (Meryl Streep Academy Awards Acceptance Speech).

In this example the strategy is realized in an attempt of the speaker to defuse the situation with the help of the joke. The speaker is sarcastic because of her winning of the Oscar again. Meryl Streep demonstrates strategic optimism to make a positive impression on the listeners and to express a positive attitude to the situation. The analysis of video with this speech confirms that the actress really joked because her phrase was accompanied with smile, laughter and lively intonation.

The strategy of seeking agreement (assert a common point of view, attitude, show empathy for the interlocutor) aimed at establishing good relationships and interpersonal understanding. It is realized in an effort to demonstrate the unity of feelings and attitudes, and in an attempt to prove that there is a shared vision of certain events and experiences. Etiquette speech acts of consent, understanding and compassion can be attributed to this strategy. For example: "*Starting in 2014, I started monitoring recruits as they cycled through police academies in the state of New Jersey, and I found that women were failing at rates between 65 and 80 percent, due to varying aspects of the physical fitness test. I learned that a change in policy now required recruits to pass the fitness exam within 10 short workout sessions. This had the greatest impact on women. The change meant that recruits had about three weeks out of a five-month-long academy to pass the fitness exam. This just didn't make sense, though.*" (Ivonne Roman)

The provided quote illustrates realization of this strategy because the speaker demonstrates the understanding of the problem as she is a policewoman herself. She tries to prove that she shares the same vision as other women who want to join police, and she wants the audience to understand this situation.

In the following example one can see the realization of this strategy in the expression of sympathy, pragmatic content of which is the display of empathy and compassion.

*"I found that women make up less than 13 percent of police officers. Even worse, this number hasn't changed much in the past 20 years. And they make up just three percent of police chiefs as of 2013, the last time the data was collected. We know that we can improve those rates." (Ivonne Roman)*

Negative politeness strategies (strategies of distance) are most often used in incentive speech constructions, which threaten positive outcome of verbal communication, because they communicatively press the interlocutor to impulse him to do some actions.

When realising negative politeness strategies, representatives of English linguoculture prefer implied speech acts. As the result of regular implementation of distancing strategies, the particular style of communication is used, because all those strategies aimed at realization of one hyperstrategy. The pragmatic content of this hyperstrategy is to reduce the impact on the addressee and to demonstrate the respect to his personal independence.

Hence, strategies of distance are the strategies of mitigation, appeal to which are predetermined by: 1) the striving of the speaker to "save face", his and the interlocutor's (prescription, glorification); 2) the intention of self-presentation in order to make an impression of a competent, tactful interlocutor; 3) the desire of the speaker to avoid unwanted negative emotions in the course of communication; 4) the following communicative values as positivity of communication, cooperativeness, tolerance, tact, etc. (Schiffrin 1994: 354)

The strategy of implicit speech acts usage (be conventionally implicit in relation to the addressee) is considered the most widespread negative politeness

strategy. The pragmatic component of this strategy is fulfilling of needs in saving of interlocutor's "negative face", which is associated with seeking of independence and freedom, with inviolability of personal territory of the subject of communication, with the possibility of reaction choice to one or another speech event of the speaker. (Brown 1983: 176)

The strategy of implicit speech acts usage helps to reduce communicational pressure on the interlocutor and to avoid conflict in situation with such speech acts as reproach, negative evaluation, disagreement, etc. Similar formulations of verbal communication threaten the image of the interlocutor and can provoke misunderstanding and unpleasant consequences for both communicants. This strategy reduces significantly the negative perlocutive effect of such utterances.

We will demonstrate the realization of the discussed above strategy through speech acts which express accusation in the following example: "*This brings me to the press. We need the principled press to hold power to account, to call them on the carpet for every outrage. That's why our founders enshrined the press and its freedoms in our constitution.*" (Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes).

There is a hidden example of accusation. The speaker uses implicit speech constructions with the hidden illocutionary content of the accusation. Apparently, the illocutionary aim of Meryl Streep is to criticize the press for its inaction.

The other example of hidden disagreement and accusation can be found in the other Meryl Streep's phrase from the same speech. She is against the thought that America is crowded with foreigners, and that this is the main problem of the country: "*Hollywood is crawling with outsiders and foreigners. If you kick 'em all out, you'll have nothing to watch but football and mixed martial arts, which are not the arts... Hollywood, foreigners, and the press. But who are we? And, you know, what is Hollywood anyway? It's just a bunch of people from other places.*" (Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes).

The speaker expresses disagreement and accusation through repeating implicit SA in the form of questions. At the explicit level, it seems that the speaker

asks questions to get the answers to them. Actually, the speaker uses the strategy of implicit SA usage to cover up representative SA of negative evaluation of government's opinion.

While considering the main cases of the strategy of implicit SA usage in the course of verbal interaction, it can be stated that the use of these speech acts helps to significantly reduce the communicative pressure on the interlocutor, maintain the social image of the addressee and, at the same time, achieve the stated goal of verbal communication.

The strategy of minimizing the degree of intervention (minimize interference in the communicative space of the interlocutor) is concerned with the idea that the speaker tries to minimize interference in the communicative space of the interlocutor by formulating the utterance of persuasive character as softly as possible. Most often this strategy is realized by the ESAs of request and advice. At the language level, it can be realized in the following constructions: conditional sentences, subjunctive mood, inversion, interrogative sentences etc.

For example: "So I only ask the famously well-heeled Hollywood Foreign Press and all of us in our community to join me in supporting the committee to protect journalists. Because we're going to need them going forward. And they'll need us to safeguard the truth." (Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes).

This case demonstrates that the speaker, despite her dissatisfaction with the press inaction, tries to minimize communicative pressure on the addressee. By using both the strategy of implicit speech acts usage and the present strategy, she conceals the command with the SA of advice.

"...Tommy Lee Jones said to me, isn't it such a privilege, Meryl, just to be an actor. Yeah, it is. And we have to remind each other of the privilege and the responsibility of the act of empathy. We should all be very proud of the work Hollywood honors here tonight." (Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes).

This situation demonstrates how the speaker masks the appeal in the form of advice to encourage the interlocutor to take an action. Thus, she minimizes the degree of intervention, and it helps the interlocutor to determine their further actions.

It is interesting that the examples above demonstrate the realization of more than one strategy. In general, the strategy of minimizing the degree of intervention is most often used with the strategy of implicit speech acts usage. Thus, we can conclude, that more than one strategy can be used in one and the same utterance.

The strategy of pessimism manifestation (be pessimistic in uttering) is characterized by doubt and uncertainty of the utterance relevance. This strategy implicates the speaker's assumption that the addressee understands his desire to leave the possibility for addressee's refusal to take an action (Jensen 1997: 112).

The strategy of pessimism manifestation is characteristic of the situation when the speaker, trying to resolve a particular issue, appeals to the interlocutor. Whereas providing or searching for an answer can limit personal freedom of addressee, the speaker resorts to strategic pessimism, thus accenting on the small implementation probability of the discussed issue.

As the previous strategy, this one can be realized by conditional sentences, subjunctive mood, inversion, interrogative sentences etc.

In the following example, there is an illustration of the strategy of pessimism manifestation used by the speaker, because there is a noticeable doubt in what she says.

*"We can increase the number of women, we can reduce that gender disparity, by simply changing exams that produce disparate outcomes. We have the tools. We have the research, we have the science, we have the law. This, my friends, should be a very easy fix, if we start doing it." (Ivonne Roman)*

In this situation, the speaker makes a request and, trying to be polite, uses the strategy as if she leaves the right to refuse for the addressee. This is a manifestation of strategic pessimism in this situation.

The strategy of formal respect (respect the addressee) is realized in the case when the speaker tries to increase the image of the interlocutor and to object to him courtesy and respect.

This strategy should be treated as negative only in cases of formal appeals, and as positive in cases when the speaker uses names and informal appeals. Treated as positive, this strategy is used to satisfy the needs of the individuals in respect from the others. Treated as negative, it is used to emphasize the considerable social distance and the degree of authority of the addressee (Олянич 2007: 315). Within public discourse this strategy belongs to negative politeness strategy, because this type of discourse belongs to official-business sphere.

According to the researchers, this strategy is also used in etiquette formulations, because through them the speaker can express a respectful attitude towards the participant of the conversation at the speech level (Jensen 1997: 52). There is an illustration to this strategy in ESA of congratulations, which demonstrates the respect towards the addressee: "*It really means the world to this initiative to have such powerful, respected and admired individuals speaking on behalf of this issue. So congratulations on the work that you've done, and we're going to keep working.*" (Michelle Obama)

As it was stated earlier, the uttering can be expressed by more than one strategy. In our case, it is a mixture of the strategy of formal respect, the strategy of demonstrating the curiosity towards the addressee and the strategy of gift giving. This can testify that both the strategies of positive and negative politeness can be actualised in one and the same utterance.

A means of expressing a strategy of formal respect is appeal, which is also called "the epithet of attitude". This epithet can be demonstrated in the following example, which illustrates the respectful but distanced appeal to the audience: "*Thank you guys for being, for allowing me to be the tiniest part of your phenomenal, extraordinary legacy. I am forever in your debt. My crew and my cast, I love you. You are my equals. You are my betters. I could have never been here without you.*" (Rami Malek)

With the help of this strategy, in the cases of tense communicational situations, the speaker manages to stay within the context of etiquette and, if necessary, to soften SA, which threaten the image of addressee.

The strategy of apology (apologize to the interlocutor) is realized in three components: the one who caused some harm (the speaker), the one who was harmed (the addressee) and the harm itself (Макаров 2003: 275).

Some researchers think that apologizing is always self-humiliation in relation to another. In the case, when the speaker offends the interlocutor, he finds himself in situation of "double constraint": if he apologizes, he damages his face; if he doesn't apologize, he harms the interlocutor (Johannesen 1967: 56). However, some think that this statement is true only if one, who apologized, did it for serious fault. Whereas in the situation of apologizing for slight misconduct, the speaker, on the contrary, strengthens his positive image of a polite person (Макаров 2003: 277).

On the speech level, the strategy of apologizing is realized in the ESA of apology, the kernel of which is implicit and explicit expressive "apologize". For example: "*Recently we discovered a video of two team members who thought their acts would be a funny YouTube hoax. We sincerely apologise for this incident. We thank members of the online community, who quickly alerted us and allowed us to take immediate action.*" (Patrick Doyle)

This example demonstrates the case, in which the speaker apologizes not for his fault, but for somebody else's fault. It helps him to gain positive image and generally favorable attitude of the addressee.

Therefore, the main pragmatic content of the strategy of apology is taking responsibility from the speaker's side for the damage, caused by him or by someone else. The goal of this strategy is to relieve tension by the implementation of ritual, stereotyped ESA, which help to adjust the tension situation and to stay within the frames of etiquette norms and politeness.

The strategy of appealing to the norm (present an act that threatens the recipient's image as a general rule) is realized when the speaker refers to the

general rule to take responsibility off himself for the SA uttering, that threatens his face.

*"And this instinct to humiliate, when it's modeled by someone in the public platform, by someone powerful, it filters down into everybody's life, because it kind of gives permission for other people to do the same thing. Disrespect invites disrespect. Violence incites violence. When the powerful use their position to bully others, we all lose."* (Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes).

By using the strategy of appealing to the norm in this example, Meryl Streep formulates SA and confirms it, presenting it as relentless truth. She tries to feel confident and become more meaningful in the eyes of the listeners. The speaker also wants to assure the listeners that she is right.

The analysis of public speeches demonstrates that the following strategies are most widely used: among the strategies of positive politeness – the strategy of gift giving to the addressee (which combines the strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval, sympathy to the interlocutor; the strategy of paying attention to the addressee, his interests, desires; the strategy of demonstrating the curiosity towards the addressee), and separately the strategy of paying attention to the addressee, his interests, desires; among the strategies of negative politeness – the strategy of implicit speech acts usage, the strategy of minimizing the degree of intervention and the strategy of pessimism manifestation. They certify the obvious communicative formality of such type of verbal interaction as public speaking. Moreover, the combination of two or more strategies, both positive and negative, can be used.

### **3.2 Etiquette Speech Acts in English Public Speaking**

Positive and negative politeness strategies are implemented through etiquette speech acts, with the help of which the speaker expresses his feelings and attitude towards what is happening (Merril 2009: 11). Geoffrey Leech names such speech acts "intrinsically polite" (Merril 2009: 14). Since almost every etiquette speech act



is a display of respect and good attitude, this suggests that etiquette can be verbalized by strategies of both positive and negative politeness.

Etiquette speech acts of greetings and farewells. **Greeting** as the "signal of social solidarity" (Driscoll, Brizee 2010) means developing of contact and contains important emotive and psychological load in the process of verbal interaction. The form of greeting determines the course of further communication and its tone, because greeting prepares the "ground" for the next conversation and also establishes a certain atmosphere of communication (Brown 1983: 56).

ESA of greeting is the necessary component of polite and etiquette communication of public discourse. In the following example, Michelle Obama greets her folks in order to express recognition and welcoming. Positive attitude towards the addressee is expressed by the strategy of paying attention to the addressee, his interests and desires. At the language level it is realized in the *command "Rest yourselves"*, with the help of which Michele pragmatically shows that she cares about the audience. There is also the realisation of the Strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval, sympathy to the interlocutor, presented by the intensifier *so much*. She uses declarative, imperative and exclamatory sentences, through which the listeners can understand her message.

*"Thank you all so much. You guys, that's a command – rest yourselves. We're almost at the end. Hello, everyone. And, may I say for the last time officially, welcome to the White House. Yes!" (Michelle Obama)*

The next example demonstrates how the speaker addresses the audience at the prom. At the pragmatic level, the speaker's intention is to endear the audience. To do this, he uses the strategy of promoting optimism in relationships with the help of joking. Moreover, he starts with the negative politeness strategy of formal respect (*ladies and gentlemen*), and then turns it into the positive politeness strategy of formal respect (*graduates, follow me on Twitter*). The Strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval and sympathy to the interlocutor is manifested in expressive adjective (*exciting day*). The strategy of paying attention to the addressee can be seen in the phrase *We went to High School together*, with the help

of which the speaker admits that he is interested in the audience, and wants them to understand it cognitively. The speaker mostly uses declarative sentences and one imperative (*follow me on Twitter*).

"Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Today is an exciting day: today I'm going to give you a speech. Now, graduates, I don't know if you know me, but I'm Chase. We went to High School together. That was good times, follow me on Twitter." (Chase Dahl at the Weber High School)

The following example of ESA of greeting has the strategy of promoting optimism in relationships. It is realized in asking the questions about state of affairs and health (*How are you? It's been great, hasn't it?*), and in joking (*I've been blown away by the whole thing. In fact, I'm leaving*). The speaker, Ken Robinson, wants to create a positive impression on the audience, which is why he uses declarative and interrogative sentences. Moreover, thus he starts the cognitive process of audience's attention.

"Good morning. How are you? It's been great, hasn't it? I've been blown away by the whole thing. In fact, I'm leaving." (Ken Robinson, TED Talk)

In the speech, presented below, Carl Aquino says a greeting, which is accompanied by ESA of gratitude (*Before I commenced my speech I would first like to thank...*). By using hyperbolized construction "*who flew from halfway around the world*" and expressive performative "*I would first like to thank*" the speaker transfers his emotional, not indifferent attitude to the addressee and realizes the strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval, sympathy to the interlocutor, demonstrating the curiosity, gift giving and formal respect. The speaker's intention is to acknowledge people who helped him. He appeals to their senses, and his speech is manifested in declarative sentences.

"Good evening class of 2010! Before I commenced my speech I would first like to thank my family, especially my aunt and uncle who came down from California and my grandparents who flew from halfway around the world. I also like to thank my friends and my academic adjudicators. Without any of you I would not be where I am today. Thank you, because without your help I would not have

*been given this chance to represent the class with the lengthy speech comprised of highly personal anecdotes. A chance I now plan to take full advantage of."* (Carl Aquino, a 2010 graduate from West Hall High School)

Here is a similar example to the previous one, where greeting is followed by ESA of gratitude (*On behalf of senior class I would like to thank...*). The speaker expresses gratitude and unity by using pronoun *we* (*we thank you*), through which the strategy of seeking agreement is realized. Repetition of "*we thank you*" and expressive performative "*I would like to thank*" are realized within the strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval, sympathy to the interlocutor. The speaker intent is to show the respect to his Alma Mater. He uses declarative sentences to make people easily understand his ideas.

*"Good evening! On behalf of senior class I would like to thank all the people who make the King's Academy excellent. To the Board of Governors for the wisdom you bring, the prayers you pray and the vision you lay out for TKA, we thank you. To the faculty who give you all each and every day, laboring to provide us with tremendous education, we thank you. "* (Kyle Martin addressed The King's Academy's Class of 2019)

In the next example, the speaker greets and welcomes the audience. She appeals to the listeners' senses with the help of the strategy of formal respect (*Faculty, friends, family and the class of 2018*) to express homage and courtesy towards them. Her intention is to show the honor she feels about delivering this speech (*I say my name loud and proud*). She does it with the help of declarative and imperative sentences.

*"Hello! Welcome all. Faculty, friends, family and the class of 2018. My name is Yasmin Liwa Younis. I say my name loud and proud from Baghdad, where my parents were born, to Ballis Road, the Midwest Street I grew up on, to Boston University, among the class of 2018, on Nickerson Field."* (Student Speaker Yasmin Younis)

**Farewell.** Greeting marks the beginning of verbal interaction, thus, farewell is its ending. Through the form and nature of the farewell, the interlocutors

determine the prospect of their further interaction. The motivation for choosing the right farewell formulas depends on the degree of formality that exists between the addressor and the addressee.

Similar to many others ESAs, that are used within public discourse, etiquette constructions of farewell are foremost the realization of the strategy of formal respect. The example below demonstrates also the strategy of implicit speech acts usage, because farewell is expressed implicitly. There is also the manifestation of the strategy of paying attention to the addressee, his interests, desires and of gift giving (*It has been the honor of my life to serve you, I will not stop*). The speaker reveals his intention to comply with the audience with the help of declaratives and imperatives. He conveys his ideas by appealing to the audience's experience and senses.

*"My fellow Americans, it has been the honor of my life to serve you. I will not stop. Yes we can. Thank you. God bless you."* (President Obama Farewell Speech)

Thus, the ESAs of greeting and farewell within the public sphere of communication mostly implement strategies of positive politeness, the pragmatic component of which is the expression of attention, sympathy, increased curiosity, and so on. However, sometimes in addition to the strategic formality of respect, the speaker also realizes the strategy of using implicit ESAs, while veiling greetings or goodbyes. The decisive point in interpreting and recognizing a strategy is the context through which it is clear whether the addressee is willing to pay attention and be interested in the interlocutor, or to express reproach or claim.

Etiquette speech acts of apology and gratitude. It is hard to imagine etiquette communication without SAs of **apology** and **gratitude**. They are considered to be etiquette and desemanticized acts of verbal interaction.

The analysis of politeness forms that are realized in ESAs of apology and gratitude demonstrated that the speaker uses many communicative techniques, most of which are conventionalized and semantically devastated. However, the

active use of desemanticized units of etiquette communication does not deny the fact of interest in the interlocutor (Brown 1983: 167).

Speaking specifically about ESA of **apology**, their nucleus is an explicitly or implicitly presented expressive performative verb. The main function of such constructions is to restore social balance or harmony between the participants of communication (Jensen 1997: 34). Despite the fact that SA of apology are related to maintaining a communicative distance, convergence strategies also find their realization there, because their leading pragmatic goal is to convince the interlocutors that they are respected, and to show attention and goodwill towards them.

Through the SA of apology the strategy of apology is realized. Most often it is a situation when the speaker knows in advance that his/her uttering may cause certain discomfort, but delivering of the speech is still needed. In order to save image the addressor apologizes. For example:

*"You'll have to forgive me. I've lost my voice in screaming and lamentation this weekend."* (Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes).

In this situation the speaker apologizes not for the content but for how she delivers the speech. Meryl Streep's intention is to settle this problem beforehand. She uses declarative and imperative sentences to make the audience feel she is really sorry.

The following example illustrates the implementation of ESA of apology accompanied by the SA of disagreement. Implicitly, the speaker disagrees with the policy of previous governments that is why he apologizes for their actions. He uses the pronoun *we* to show that it is not his fault, but the common one. Prime Minister Kevin Rudd in the ESA of apology realizes the strategy of seeking agreement, thus trying to clear the air, and the strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval and sympathy to the interlocutor by the repetition of the phrase *We apologise for*. He uses declarative sentences to appeal to audience's experiences.

*"We apologise for the laws and policies of successive Parliaments and governments that have inflicted profound grief, suffering and loss on these, our*

*fellow Australians. We apologise especially for the removal of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families, their communities and their country. For the pain, suffering and hurt of these Stolen Generations, their descendants and for their families left behind, we say sorry.*" (Prime Minister Kevin Rudd delivered the National Apology to Australia's Indigenous Peoples)

The next example, presented by Richard Williams, is an apology letter to future generations. In the ESA of apology he realizes the strategy of implicit speech acts usage as he expresses negative opinion about his and other people's indifferent attitude towards the planet. The role of SA of apology in this situation is to prepare the interlocutor to this information and to reduce communicative pressure. There is also an example of repetition (*Sorry*) as the manifestation of the strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval and sympathy to the interlocutor. The speaker uses declaratives while appealing to the listeners' experiences.

*"Sorry, we left you with our mess of a planet, Sorry, that we were too caught up in our own doings to do something. Sorry, we listened to people who made excuses to do nothing. I hope you forgive us." (Richard Williams. An Apology Letter to Future Generations)*

In the following example, ESA of apology acquires a different meaning, because the aim of the addressor is to really plead guilty for the damage caused, which is possible because of the strategy of apology. This communicative situation combines illocutionary meaning of apology both by its form and by its meaning. The repetition of *we are sorry* is also the manifestation of the strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval and sympathy to the interlocutor. The speaker appeals to listeners' senses through declaratives.

*"It is with shame and sorrow and deep regret for the things we have done, but I stand here today and say we were wrong, we apologise. I am sorry, we are sorry. For state-sponsored systemic oppression and rejection we are sorry. For abusing the power of the law and making criminal of citizens we are sorry. It is our collective shame that this apology took so long." (Justin Trudeau)*

**Gratitude.** Similarly to SA of apology, SAs of gratitude are ritualized and desemanticized constructions that are used extensively in English linguoculture in a wide variety of communicative situations.

To thank is just to express gratitude. SA of gratitude can be attributed to the expressive constructions through which the speaker transmits his emotional state (Jaffe 2010: 64). This point of view makes the following constructions "*thank you for*" and "*I am grateful for*" absolutely synonymic, because in both cases the speaker expresses gratitude.

There is another point of view that sees the social function of gratitude in the recognition of the benefit that a person has received from the deed of another person (Jaffe 2010: 67).

Analyzing ESA of gratitude from the point of strategies of convergence and distance, we understood that each individual ESA of gratitude has such a communicative and pragmatic content that is recognized only within the context of a particular communicative situation. Let us try to illustrate the use of linguistic politeness strategies of ESA of gratitude in public discourse.

The following example, taken from the commencement speech, has the manifestation of strategy of promoting optimism in relationships in speaker's self-irony ("*Truth be told, I never graduated from college and this is the closest I've ever gotten to a college graduation*"). There is also the realization of demonstrating the curiosity towards the addressee ("*I'm honored to be with you today for your commencement from one of the finest universities in the world*"). The sincere speaker's intent is to show his positive attitude towards the audience. He does it with the help of declaratives, appealing to listeners' senses.

*"Thank you. I'm honored to be with you today for your commencement from one of the finest universities in the world. Truth be told, I never graduated from college and this is the closest I've ever gotten to a college graduation."* (Mark Zuckerberg)

The similar situation is with the next example, appealing to the sense of humor. It is also a sincere gratitude with the manifestation of strategy of promoting

optimism in relationships by joking ("*It has made me lose weight – a win-win situation.*"). The speaker's intention to mock at herself is formulated with declaratives.

"The first thing I would like to say is thank you. Not only has Harvard had given me an extraordinary honor but the weeks of fear and nausea, I have endured at the thought of giving this commencement address. It has made me lose weight – a win-win situation. " (J.K. Rowling Speaks at Harvard Commencement)

The example below is rather humorous, because the speaker formulates the gratitude with the help of his own framework that he presented earlier *Why – Because – And*. However his intention is positive, he wants to establish close ties with the audience. This is implicit realization of strategy of promoting optimism in relationships, formulated in a declarative sentence. The speaker appeals to audience's sense of humor.

"I want to thank all of you today for giving me the opportunity to speak to you because I've been allowed to share something that means a great deal to me and I promise that if you ever use my framework it will help you even in your very own TEDx talk. " (Jahan Kalantar)

The next example consists not only of ESA of gratitude but of the SA of disagreement. The speaker thinks that there was a better album that deserved the prize, and she shown it explicitly and sincere. The exaggeration (*Thank you all from the bottom of my heart. I'm very grateful gracious*) is also the realisation of the strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval and sympathy to the interlocutor. The speaker wants to appeal to audience's senses and does it through declarative sentences.

"Thank you all from the bottom of my heart. I'm very grateful gracious but my artist of my life is Beyoncé. Lemonade was so monumental, so well thought out, and so beautiful, and so bearing. We appreciate it. " (Adele)

Here is one more example of sincere ESA of gratitude. The strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval and sympathy to the interlocutor manifests itself in the exaggeration (*inexplicably wonderful career*) and repetition (*Thank you*). The



strategic formality is realized in formal appeal (*friends, departed and here*) in order to show the respectful attitude to the audience. This example is rich in exclamations that appeal to listeners' senses.

*"Oh my god. Oh, c'mon! Oh! Alright. Thank you so much. Thank you, thank you.- MS4 - My friends, thank you, all of you, departed and here, for this, you know, inexplicably wonderful career. Thank you so much. Thank you." (Meryl Streep Academy Awards Acceptance Speech).*

Thus, the analysis of ESAs of apology and gratitude in public discourse has shown that through them the speaker implements convergence and distance strategies, depending on the communicative situation. ESAs of apology and gratitude can be a tool for expressing both positive and negative emotions. But in any case, using ESAs helps the interlocutors to stay in the context of etiquette.

Etiquette speech acts of wishes and congratulations. SA of **wishes** is usually a speech act of politeness, which is implemented by the addressor in order to pay attention to the addressee, express sympathy and consent for the life of the addressee in the future, and therefore adhere to the rules of speech etiquette of a particular linguistic culture (Варшавская 1984: 123). On this basis, ESA of wishes are, for the most part, strategies of positive politeness. It seems important to analyze which positive strategies are used by the speaker through ESA of wishes, or whether there are implementations of the distancing strategies.

In the example below, the speaker does not formulate any utterance in the form of wish (as, for example, *I wish you*), but immediately goes to wishes in the form of advice. It is understood from the context, that it is a s of wish. The addressor intents to detail exactly, what he wants the addressee to achieve in life. The appeal to the students itself is the sign that the addressee concentrates his attention on them, thus realising the strategy of paying attention to the addressee, his interests and desires. Steve Jobs address the audience, appealing to their senses, with the help of declaratives and imperatives.

*"Your time is limited, so don't waste it living someone else's life. Don't be trapped by dogma which is living with the results of other people's thinking. Don't*

*let the noise of others opinions drown out your own inner voice. And most important, have the courage to follow your heart and intuition. They somehow already know what you truly want to become. Everything else is secondary."* (Steve Jobs Stanford Commencement Speech 2005)

The next example illustrates direct SA of wish. On the pragmatic level this ESA is an expression of support and understanding. It helps the addressee to realize the strategy of gift giving. The strategy of paying attention manifests itself in the desire of addressor to convey the thought that the presence of the audience is of high importance for her. The speaker conveys his thoughts through declarative and imperative sentences.

*"...so today I wish you nothing better and similar friendships, and tomorrow I hope that even if you remember not a single word of mine, you will remember those of Seneca, another of those old Romans I met when I fled down the classical corridor in retreat from career ladders in search of ancient wisdom, as is a tale so is life, not how long it is but how good it is, is what matters. I wish you all very good lives. Thank you very much."* (J.K. Rowling Speaks at Harvard Commencement)

In the following example, there is a demonstration of both direct and indirect SA of wish. The direct one (*May God richly bless you all*) is the expression of support. The indirect is presented in the form of advice (*remember this*) which is an expression of wish how the speaker wants the audience to act in hard situations. Thus, there are the realizations of strategies of paying attention to the addressee, his interests and desires, and of gift giving. The addressor does it through declaratives and imperatives.

*"Wisdom will come to you in the unlikeliest of sources. A lot of times through failure. When you hit rock bottom, remember this, while you're struggling, rock bottom can also be a great foundation on which to build and on which to grow. May God richly bless you all. Thank you. Thank you for having me."* (Rick Rigsby)

As regards ESA of **congratulations**, it is defined as a polite speech action, which is implemented by the speaker in order to show sympathy and joy about a particular event in the interests of the addressee.

Here is the example which illustrates ESA of congratulation in the case, when addressor expresses recognition and admiration (*so let's give us a big round of applause*). Moreover, there is a SA of wish (*I wish you all the very, very, very best*). In these two examples with exaggerations we can see the realization of the strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval and sympathy to the interlocutor. The strategy of promoting optimism in relationships is realized in joking (*The world we live in is plagued with dangers: Ebola, ISIS, Global Warming, facial acne*). However, there is a realization of negative politeness strategy of formal respect (*Class of 2015*), because the speaker still wants to sound official. The addressor wants to appeal to audience's experiences, using declaratives and imperatives.

*"And I want to give a big congratulations to everyone – including myself – for being here today. The world we live in is plagued with dangers: Ebola, ISIS, Global Warming, facial acne. And despite all the odds, we still managed to graduate, so let's give us a big round of applause...Class of 2015, it's been a splendid 3 years with you, and from the bottom of my heart, I wish you all the very, very, very best. Thank you."* (Chase Dahl at the Weber High School)

The next example is also the display of sympathy and approval. The speaker uses expressive adjectives (*powerful, respected and admired individuals*) to realize the Strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval and sympathy to the interlocutor. She sounds optimistic in her desire to *keep working*, so this is the realization of the strategy of promoting optimism in relationships. The speaker appeals to listeners' senses by using declaratives and imperatives.

*"It really means the world to this initiative to have such powerful, respected and admired individuals speaking on behalf of this issue. So congratulations on the work that you've done, and we're going to keep working."* (Michelle Obama)

The following example demonstrates sympathy and recognition. Both positive and negative strategy of formal respect is realized here. The positive is

presented in an informal appeal *those who helped us get here*. The negative is manifested in the formal appeal *West Hall High School class up to 2010*. The speaker addresses to audience through a combination of declarative and imperative sentence.

*"The only thing left to say now is congratulations to the West Hall High School class up to 2010 and to those who helped us get here."* (Carl Aquino, a 2010 graduate from West Hall High School)

The cases of considered ESAs of wishes and congratulations lead to the conclusion that when expressing congratulations, the speaker may use strategies of positive, but also, depending from communicative situation, strategies of negative politeness in order to reduce communicative and emotional pressure. As far as ESA of congratulations are concerned, they are still dominated by convergence strategies, because the intention of the addressor is to really say something nice to the addressee and to convey their positive attitude.

Etiquette speech acts of request. The request refers to the etiquette speech constructions through which the speaker most often implements a strategy of the implicit SE usage. This strategy is an effective way of masking a speaker's true intent with the help of motivating ESA. The tactics of using implicit SA to drive action are different types of requests, the kindness of which depend on the mode of expression. The less direct the ESA request is, the more polite it is and more options it gets. This gives the addressor a wider range of options to choose from (Nielsen 1966: 125).

American scientists say that indirect SAs of requests allow two opposing intentions of the speaker to be fulfilled: the intention to give the interlocutor the right to choose to fulfill or not this request by communicating in an indirect form, and the intention to express his aim directly (Driscoll, Brizee 2010).

Here is an example of explicit SA of request with the directive word *ask*. This is a soft form of request, because the speaker says *I only ask to join me*. The addressor formulates it in a delicate, unobtrusive form, thus realizing the strategy of minimizing the degree of intervention with the recipient's personal space. The

speaker realizes the strategy of formal respect, addressing the audience formally and officially (*the famously well-heeled Hollywood Foreign Press and all of us in our community*). Through declaratives and imperatives she appeals to listeners' senses.

*"So I only ask the famously well-heeled Hollywood Foreign Press and all of us in our community to join me in supporting the committee to protect journalists. Because we're going to need them going forward. And they'll need us to safeguard the truth."* (Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes)

The following example demonstrates the speaker's desire for addressee to perform a specific action. She does it with the help of directive words *have to* and *should*, which makes them sound delicate. This is the realization of the strategy of minimizing the degree of intervention. There is repetition of *we* which is the realization of the strategy of exaggerated curiosity, approval and sympathy to the interlocutor. The speaker appeals to the audience's senses with the help of declarative sentences.

*"...Tommy Lee Jones said to me, isn't it such a privilege, Meryl, just to be an actor. Yeah, it is. And we have to remind each other of the privilege and the responsibility of the act of empathy. We should all be very proud of the work Hollywood honors here tonight."* (Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes)

In the following example, there is also explicit SA of request with the directive word *want*. Here the speaker expresses the strong request providing the factors that can encourage the addressee to take an action. There is an example of the strategy of promoting optimism in relationships, realized in sanguine vision of the speaker (*anything is possible*). The addressor uses imperatives and declaratives in her aim to appeal to the listeners' experiences.

*"I want you to remember that in this country, plenty of folks, including me and my husband – we started out with very little. But with a lot of hard work and a good education, anything is possible – even becoming President. That's what the American Dream is all about."* (Michelle Obama)

As we can see, in all of the above examples, ESAs of requests are indirect SA directives, which can be defined as hidden calls and prompts to take an action by the addressee. Therefore, we are talking about indirect illocutions, in which the direct meaning refers to one thing, and the intent, embedded in the utterance, to another.

### **Conclusions to Chapter 3**

1. The communicative-pragmatic model of the implementation of politeness strategies through etiquette speech acts in public discourse makes it possible to view this realization as a step-by-step process – global and local strategies and their etiquette speech embodiment. Thus, each aspect of the global politeness strategy is realized by a set of local strategies.

2. Positive politeness strategies are realised by exaggeration of interest, attention, demonstration of the exaggerated curiosity, gift giving, manifestation of optimism and seeking of agreement. Strategies of negative politeness are expressed by implicit speech acts, manifestation of pessimism, apology, minimizing the degree of intervention, appealing to the norm, and formal respect, which we consider to be a universal strategy of etiquette verbal interaction.

3. In the ESAs of greeting, farewell, gratitude, apology, wishes, congratulations and requests the speaker realizes several communicative strategies. Depending on his/her intentions of communicative communication, he/she may use both positive and negative politeness strategies at the same time. The negative strategies are most often implemented in the formal respect and the strategy of implicit speech acts. The positive strategies are most often the expression of exaggeration of interest, approval, sympathy for the interlocutor, strategy of paying attention to them, a strategy of demonstrating a strong interest in them.

4. The main linguopragmatic means of expressing speech etiquette in modern English public discourse are: declarative, imperative, interrogative and expressive etiquette constructions; etiquette speech acts with a nominal compound sentence, conditionals and subjunctive speech constructions.

## GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

This paper is devoted to English speech etiquette of public speaking. Public speaking is a type of communication in the process of which socially significant information is transferred to a large number of listeners, and is given the status of publicity. English public discourse is characterized by rituality and stereotypical use of speech acts necessary for successful verbal interaction. Speech etiquette is its essential component.

In the work, the concept of speech etiquette is considered as a complex of etiquette speech means and the rules of their usage in typical communicative situations. Speech etiquette forms its regulatory framework, and as a structural component of speech behavior, it defines the basic principles of etiquette communication and expresses a polite attitude to the interlocutors.

Speech etiquette in modern public communication is a linguistic tool for the implementation of a politeness hyperstrategy, expressed by of global and local strategies, namely: positive and negative politeness.

Positive strategies are manifested in an exaggeration of curiosity, attention, demonstration of underlined curiosity, gift giving, manifestation of optimism and seeking agreement. Negative strategies are expressed by implicit speech acts, manifestation of pessimism, apology, minimization of the degree of intervention, appeal to the norm and formal respect. A common strategy of each etiquette act is a strategy of formal respect, which can be considered as a universal strategy of etiquette verbal interaction.

The etiquette speech act as a unit of etiquette communication is closely related to performativity, and therefore directly correlates with the speaker's expression of politeness. It has a special structure and mainly well-expressed illocutionary power, and it gives to the speaker the speech instrument for courteous attitude to the interlocutor. The Paper analyses the realization of the polite linguistic behavior in such etiquette speech acts as greeting, farewell, apology, gratitude, wishes, congratulations and request.



Etiquette speech acts are a means of verbalizing the category of politeness in the English language-speakers' vision of the world, they act as indicators of speech etiquette, have a specific, lexical and grammatical structure peculiar to the English language, and are realized in certain stereotypical communication situations. Therefore, their actualization is impossible without a system of accumulated mental ready-made scenarios of etiquette communicative behavior, the practical implementation of which naturally combines linguistic and non-linguistic components.

## RESUME

Ця кваліфікаційна магістерська робота присвячена англійському мовленнєвому етикету публічного мовлення. Публічне мовлення – це тип спілкування, в процесі якого соціально значуща інформація передається великій кількості слухачів і їй надається статусу публічності. Англійський публічний дискурс характеризується стереотипним використанням мовленнєвих актів, необхідних для успішної вербальної взаємодії. Мовленнєвий етикет є його важливою складовою.

У роботі поняття мовленнєвого етикету означає сукупність етикетних мовленнєвих засобів і правила їх використання в типових комунікативних ситуаціях. Мовленнєвий етикет формує свою нормативну базу, як структурний компонент мовленнєвої поведінки, визначає основні принципи етикетного спілкування і виражає ввічливе ставлення до співрозмовників.

Мовленнєвий етикет в сучасній публічній комунікації – це мовний інструмент реалізації ввічливої гіперстратегії, виражений глобальними та локальними стратегіями, а саме: позитивної та негативної ввічливості. Позитивні стратегії проявляються у перебільшенні цікавості, уваги, демонстрації підкресленої цікавості, даруванні подарунків, ствердженні оптимістичності і прагненні згоди. Негативні стратегії виражаються непрямыми мовленнєвими актами, проявом песимізму, вибачення, мінімізацією ступеня втручання, апеляцією до норми і проявом поваги. Загальна стратегія для кожного етикетного акту – це стратегія формальної поваги, яка може розглядатися як універсальна стратегія словесної етикетної взаємодії.

Етикетний мовленнєвий акт виступає як одиниця етикетного спілкування і тісно пов'язаний з перформативністю, а тому безпосередньо корелює з вираженням ввічливості мовцем. Він має особливу структуру і в основному добре виражену ілокуціональну силу, що надає мовцю мовленнєвий інструмент для ввічливого ставлення до співрозмовника.

Етикетні мовленнєві акти є засобом вербалізації категорії ввічливості, вони виступають індикаторами мовленнєвого етикету, мають специфічну лексико-граматичну структуру, властиву англійській мові, і реалізуються в певних стереотипних ситуаціях спілкування. Тому їх актуалізація неможлива без системи готових розумових сценаріїв етикетно-комунікативної поведінки, практична реалізація яких поєднує мовні та немовні компоненти.

У першому розділі розглядаються основні теоретичні підходи до вивчення мовленнєвого етикету як загальної мовної категорії та аналізується мовленнєвий етикет як структурний компонент комунікативної поведінки мовців.

У другому розділі йдеться мова про публічну комунікацію, публічне мовлення та його види. Тут також подана інформація про публічну промову як форму публічного мовлення та її характеристики.

Третій розділ присвячений стратегіям ввічливості та лінгвопрагматичним характеристикам публічного дискурсу. У ньому поданий аналіз реалізації ввічливої мовної поведінки в таких етикетних мовленнєвих актах як привітання, прощання, вибачення, подяка, побажання, привітання та прохання.

Ключові поняття: лінгвокогнітивний аспект, комунікативно-прагматичний аспект, мовленнєвий етикет, ввічлива словесна взаємодія, комунікативна поведінка, публічне спілкування, публічне мовлення, етикетні мовленнєві акти, стратегії позитивної ввічливості, стратегії негативної ввічливості.

## REFERENCE LITERATURE

1. Вердербер Р., Вердербер К. Психология общения. СПб., 2003. С. 233.
2. Введенская Л.А., Павлова Л.Г., Кашаева Е.Ю. Русский язык. Культура речи. Деловое общение. М.: Кнорус. 2014. С. 189.
3. Буянова Л.Ю., Нечай Ю.П. Эмотивность и эмоциогенность языка: механизмы экспликации и концептуализации. Краснодар: Кубанский госуд. университет, 2006. - 277 с.
4. Ворожбитова А. А. Теория текста: антропоцентрическое направление. М.: Высшая школа, 2005. - 365 с.
5. Дейк Т.А. ван. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. М., «Прогресс», 1989. – 312 с.
6. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. М.: Гнозис, 2004. - 389 с.
7. Лингвистический Энциклопедический Словарь. Гл. ред. В.Н. Ярцева. М.: «Советская энциклопедия», 1990. - 688 с.
8. Михалева О. Л. Политический дискурс: специфика манипулятивного воздействия. М.: Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», 2009. - 256 с.
9. Олянич А.В. Презентационная теория дискурса: Монография. М.: Гнозис, 2007. - 407 с.
10. Прохоров Ю.Е. Действительность. Текст. Дискурс: Учебное пособие. М.: Флинта: Наука, 2004. - 224 с.
11. Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса. М.: Гнозис, 2004. - 326 с.
12. Арутюнова, Н.Д. Дискурс (Текст) / Н.Д. Арутюнова // Языкознание. Большой энциклопедический словарь / Н.Д. Арутюнова. - М.: Большая Российская энциклопедия, 1998. – С.136 -137.
13. Бенвенист, Э. Общая лингвистика (Текст) / Э. Бенвенист. - М. : Прогресс, 1974. - 448 с.
14. Блох, М.Я. Публичная речь и ее просодический строй (Текст) / М.Я. Блох, Е.Л. Фрейдина. - М. : Прометей, 2011. - 236 с.

15. Варшавская, А.И. Смысловые отношения в структуре языка (Текст) / А.И. Варшавская. - Л. : Изд-во ЛГУ, 1984. - 136 с.
16. Василик, М. А. Основы теории коммуникации (Текст) / М. А. Василик. - М. : Гардарики, - 616 с.
17. Виноградов, С.И. Нормативный и коммуникативно-прагматический аспекты культуры речи (Текст) / С.И. Виноградов // Культура русской речи и эффективность общения. - М. : Наука, 1996. - С. 121-151.
18. Винокур, Г.О. Грамматические наблюдения в области технической терминологии (Текст) / Г.О. Винокур // Труды МИИФЛИ. - 1939. - Т. 5. - С. 354.
19. Горелов, И.Н. Основы психолингвистики (Текст) / И.Н. Горелов, К.Ф. Седов. - М. : Лабиринт, 2001. - 224 с.
20. Грайс, Г.П. Логика и речевое общение (Текст) / Г.П. Грайс // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. - 1985. - № 16. - С. 217-236.
21. Граудина, Л.К. Культура русской речи (Текст) / Л.К. Граудина, Е.Н. Ширяев. - М. : Издательская группа НОРМА-ИНФРА, 1999. - 560 с.
22. Дементьев, В.В. Изучение речевых жанров : обзор работ в современной русистике (Текст) / В.В. Дементьев // Вопросы языкознания. - 1997. - № 1. - С. 109-121.
23. Звегинцев, В.А. Предложение и его отношение к языку и речи (Текст) / В.А. Звегинцев. - М. : Изд-во МГУ, 1976. - 307 с.
24. Казакова, Н.В. Формирование институциональных особенностей научно-учебного дискурса (на материале английских грамматик XVI-XIX вв.) (Текст) : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.19 / Н.В. Казакова. - Ижевск, 2012. - 26 с.
25. Карасик, В.И. О типах дискурса (Текст) / В.И. Карасик // Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс. - Волгоград : Перемена, 2000. - С. 5-20.
26. Карасик, В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс (Текст) / В.И. Карасик. - Волгоград : Перемена, 2002. - 477 с.

27. Кашкин В.Б. Введение в теорию коммуникации: Учеб. пособие. Воронеж: Изд-во ВГТУ, 2000. 175 с.
28. Кипкаева, В.С. Уровни восприятия и понимания письменного дискурса (Текст) / В.С. Кипкаева // Проблемы управления. - 2008. - № 1 (26). - С. 190-194.
29. Коноваленко, М.Ю. Теория коммуникации (Электронный ресурс) / М.Ю. Коноваленко. - 2014. - Режим доступа: <http://static2.ozone.ru/multimedia/book file/1008797468.pdf>
30. Красильникова, Е.М. Просодическая реализация функции воздействия в текстах информационного и ораторского стилей : (экспериментально фонетическое исследование на материале американского варианта английского языка) (Текст) : автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук : 10.02.04 / Е.М. Красильникова. - Волгоград, 2005. - 24 с.
31. Кубрякова, Е.С. Виды пространств текста и дискурса (Текст) / Е.С. Кубрякова, О.А. Александрова // Категоризация мира: пространство и время : материалы научной конференции. - М., 1997. - С. 19-23.
32. Кубрякова, Е.С. Язык и знание (Текст) / Е.С. Кубрякова. - М. : Языки славянской культуры, 2004. - 560 с.
33. Макаров, М.Л. Основы теории дискурса (Текст) / М.Л. Макаров. - М. : Гнозис, 2003. - 375 с.
34. Ножин, Е.А. Мастерство устного выступления (Текст) / Е.А. Ножин. - М. : Политиздат, 1989. - 225 с.
35. Олешков, М.Ю. Основы функциональной лингвистики (Текст) / М.Ю. Олешков. - Нижний Тагил : Изд-во НГСПА, 2006. - 146 с.
36. Рыбакова, О. Н. Дискурсивные, коммуникативно-прагматические и семиотические характеристики англоязычной печатной рекламы (Текст) : дис. ... канд. филол. наук / О.Н. Рыбакова. - Иваново, 1999. - 170 с.
37. Сиротинина, В.В. Соотношение элитарного типа речевой культуры и риторического мастерства (Текст) / В.В. Сиротинина // Риторическая культура в современном обществе : тезисы докладов IV Международной конференции по риторике. - М. : МИУ, 2000. - С. 30-39.

38. Стрельникова, С.В. Национальные особенности речевого жанра телеинтервью в российской и американской коммуникативных культурах (Текст) : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.19 / С.В. Стрельникова. - Воронеж, 2005. - 271 с.
39. Сусов, И.П. Введение в языкознание (Текст) / И.П. Сусов. - М. : Восток - Запад, 2006. - 382 с.
40. Толстой, Н.И. Язык и культура (Текст) / Н.И. Толстой // Русский язык и современность. Проблемы и перспективы развития русистики. - М. : Изд-во ИС РАН, 1991. - С. 5-22.
41. Уилби, П. Концепции публичной политики, связей с общественностью и публичной ком-муникации (Электронный ресурс) / П. Уилби. - 2003. - Режим доступа: [http://www.nscs.ru/docs/Peter\\_Wilby.doc](http://www.nscs.ru/docs/Peter_Wilby.doc)
42. Хабермас, Ю. Моральное сознание и коммуникативное действие (Текст) / Ю. Хабермас. СПб. : Наука, 2000. - 380 с.
43. Чернявская, В.Е. Интерпретация научного текста (Текст) / В.Е. Чернявская. - М. : КомКнига, 2009. - 128 с.
44. Ширяев, Е.Н. Современная теоретическая концепция культуры речи (Текст) / Е.Н. Ширяев // Культура русской речи. - М. : ИНФРА, 1998. - С. 5-22.
45. Ширяева, Т.А. Когнитивное моделирование институционального делового дискурса (Текст) : автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук : 10.02.19 / Т.А. Ширяева. - Краснодар, 2008. 50 с.
46. Brown, G. Discourse Analysis (Текст) / G. Brown, G. Yule. - Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1983. - 298 p.
47. Keller, R. Diskursforschung. Eine Einleitung fuer SozialwissenschaftlerInnen (Текст) / R. Keller. - Wiesbaden : VS Verlag fuer Sozialwiss, 2004. - 130 S.
48. Schiffrin, D. Approaches to Discourse (Текст) / D. Schiffrin. - Cambridge : Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1994. - 470 p.

49. ABC News. (2012, January 25). Albanese accused of plagiarising Hollywood speech. Retrieved from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2012-01-25/albanese-accused-of-plagiarising-speech/3793486>
50. American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
51. Aristotle. (1954). *Rhetoric* (W. Rhys Roberts, Trans.). New York: Modern Library.
52. Brownell, J. (2006). *Listening: Attitudes, principles and skills* (3rd Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
53. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2012). Are you at high risk for serious illness from flu? Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/Features/FluHighRisk/>
54. Cruikshank, B. (2004). Plagiarism: It's Alive! *Texas Library Journal*, 80(4), 132-136.
55. Danoff-Burg, J. (2002). PowerPoint writing guide. Retrieved from [http://www.columbia.edu/itc/cerc/seeu/dr/ppt\\_writing.html](http://www.columbia.edu/itc/cerc/seeu/dr/ppt_writing.html)
56. Driscoll, D. L., & Brizee, A. (2010, July 13). Stereotypes and biased language. Retrieved from <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/608/05>
57. DuPre, A. (1998). *Humor and the healing arts: A multimethod analysis of humor use in health care*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Farhi, P. (2006, November 21). 'Seinfeld' comic Richards apologizes for racial rant. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/21/AR2006112100242.html>
58. Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument. *Communication Monographs*, 51, 1-22.
59. Harper, G. K. (2007). *Copyright Crash Course*. Retrieved from <http://copyright.lib.utexas.edu/copyol2.html>
60. Iannarino, N. T. (2011, November). *Shangri-Lost in the international house of cancer: An analysis of Julia Sweeney's humorous illness narrative* (PowerPoint



slides). Retrieved from author (slide adapted and used via permission of N. Iannarino).

61. Jaffe, C. (2010). *Public speaking: Concepts and skills for a diverse society* (6th Ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

62. Jensen, J. V. (1997). *Ethical issues in the communication process*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

63. Johannesen, R. L. (1967). *Ethics and persuasion: Selected readings*. New York: Random House.

64. Langer, E. J. (1989). *Mindfulness*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press.

65. Lucas, S. E. (2001). *The art of public speaking* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

66. Merrill, J. C. (2009). Tenzin Gyatso, the Dalai Lama: Universal compassion. In C. Christians & J. Merrill (Eds.), *Ethical communication* (pp. 11-17). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

67. Mill, J.S. (1987). Utilitarianism. In A. Ryan (Ed.), *Utilitarianism and other essays* (pp. 272- 338). New York: Penguin Classics.

68. Moon, J. D. (1993). Theory, citizenship, and democracy. In G. E. Marcus & R. L. Hanson, *Reconsidering the democratic public* (pp. 211-222). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

69. Nielsen, T. R. (1966). *Ethics of speech communication*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs Merrill. *Nine Planets*. (2011).

70. O'Neill, M. T. (1980). Plagiarism: Writing Responsibly. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 43, 34-36. *Peace One Day*. (n.d.). Introduction. Retrieved from <http://www.peaceoneday.org/en/about/Introduction> Chapter 3 Ethics in Public Speaking [www.publicspeakingproject.org](http://www.publicspeakingproject.org) 3-16

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

1. Ted 2019 – Ivonne Roman. How policewomen make communities safer.  
[https://www.ted.com/talks/ivonne\\_roman\\_how\\_policewomen\\_make\\_communities\\_safer/transcript#t-7113](https://www.ted.com/talks/ivonne_roman_how_policewomen_make_communities_safer/transcript#t-7113)
2. Michelle Obama in Her Final Remarks as First Lady (2017)  
<https://time.com/4626283/michelle-obama-final-remarks-transcript/>
3. Meryl Streep powerful speech at the Golden Globes (2017)  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EV8tsnRFUZw>
4. Meryl Streep Academy Awards Acceptance Speech (2011)  
<http://aaspeechesdb.oscars.org/link/084-3/>
5. Meryl Streep: Touching Speech & Dramatic Reading (2014)  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pfODSbgpxOg>
6. Domino's President Patrick Doyle Responds To Prank Video (2009)  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dem6eA7-A2I>
7. J.K. Rowling Speaks at Harvard Commencement (2008)  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wHGqp8lz36c>
8. Apology to Australia's Indigenous peoples (2008)  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RThkO3XBThs>
9. Steve Jobs Stanford Commencement Speech 2005  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D1R-jKKp3NA&list=WL&index=4&t=0s>
10. Justin Trudeau offers formal apology (2017)  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xi23IL3b6cs>