



A pragmatic analysis of impoliteness strategies in the second debate of the 2024 vice-presidential candidates

Mentari Ramadanti Kusumah

English Language and Literature, Faculty of Language and Literature Education,
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Jl. Dr. Setiabudi No.229, Bandung, Indonesia
Corresponding author email: mentariramadanti13@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research is a pragmatic study that aims to explore the types and functions of impoliteness strategies and identify the vice-presidential candidates' responses to the impoliteness strategies performed in the debate. This study investigates impolite acts performed in the Vice President's 2nd Debate by three candidates: Muhaimin Iskandar, Gibran Rakabuming, and Mahfud MD. This research employed a descriptive qualitative method in which the data were in the form of utterances. Drawing on the theories from Culpeper et al. (2003) and Culpeper (2005, 2011) on impoliteness strategies, the results reveal that all five types of impoliteness strategies are used by the three candidates, with Bald on Record Impoliteness (30%) as the most dominant type used in the debate. This indicates that the candidates mostly attack their opponents in a direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way. Moreover, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Sarcasm, and Mock Impoliteness have the same percentage: 22.5%. Regarding functions, the most dominant function used by the candidates is Affective Impoliteness. This suggests that the candidates aim to provoke emotional outbursts in each other. As for responses, the most frequently used response by the candidates is Countering the Face Attack (75%). All the candidates used this response because they responded to another candidate's attack to defend their face from the face attack. In conclusion, this research has demonstrated that the use of impoliteness strategies in debate can impact whether citizens vote for politicians or hate the politicians due to their performance on the debate stage.

Keywords: impoliteness strategies; pragmatic analysis; presidential debate; responses; vice-presidential candidates

How to cite (in APA 7th edition style):

Kusumah, M. R. (2026). A pragmatic analysis of impoliteness strategies in the second debate of the 2024 vice-presidential candidates. *Passage: Journal of English Language and Literature*, 14(1), 35-48. <https://doi.org/10.17509/psg.v14i1.75137>

Article Info: Received: 11 October 2024; Revised: 6 April 2026; Accepted: 8 June 2026;
Available Online: 16 August 2026

INTRODUCTION

Language is essential to politicians. This is because language provides the opportunity for politicians to explore the resources available through language to manipulate words to persuade people. This is in line with Beard (2000), who sees the language of politics as an important occupation because it helps people to understand how language is used by those who wish to gain power, those who wish to exercise power, and those who wish to keep power. Further, he views language as the vehicle of politics, which sometimes carries risks to public opinion. One situation in which politicians use

language is when they need to perform debates to communicate their vision and mission to citizens before being selected as a president or a vice president. The political debates become a tool to impress the citizens as an audience through the language they speak.

The choice of language and the way they convey it in expressing their ideas and intentions seem to influence the success of the debate. Therefore, it is safe to say that language plays a significant role in achieving political objectives. In a country like Indonesia, which is regarded as a democratic country, political debates in a presidential

election campaign have always become trending topics on social media and television. Presidential debates are always held along with the election every 5 years. In 2024, there are 3 candidates for the election of President and Vice President. The three candidates have 5 debate schedules, and it is separated between presidential candidates and vice-presidential candidates, with 2 of the schedules made only for vice-presidential debates. Debates between politicians become one of the interesting cases to be discussed since they potentially use impolite statements to compete with each other so that they will catch the heart of society to choose them.

This, then, defines what happened in the Indonesian Presidential Election Debate 2024. The reason why the researcher is interested in examining the phenomenon of the Vice President Debate is that it became controversial on social media and on television news right after the debate was held. In a situation in which the debate became dramatic after it was held, it was usually as a result of netizens sharing cut videos and making controversial comments. The cut videos made provocations to hate one another's candidates. In the video on the debate stage, they attacked each other with vulgar statements. In this case, they used impoliteness to attack other candidates, but one of them was apparently loose and could not handle other candidates again. The candidate who lost used a sad expression, so that netizens felt sorry for him and promised to vote for him. In the case of Donald Trump's debate, he used impolite strategies to win in politics, but Indonesia is the opposite. The one who uses impoliteness strategies seems to be hated by citizens, and netizens mostly feel sympathetic to the loser in the debate stage. Given the circumstances, the researcher wants to deeply research impoliteness strategies that were used in the debate, which influenced the atmosphere on the debate stage.

Impoliteness is associated with using language in an inappropriate context, which can be perceived negatively by other people. Bousfield and Locher (2008) argue that impoliteness behavior is negatively marked behavior. It means that society has its own social norms that are agreed upon and applied in their life; somebody is considered impolite if he or she acts opposite to the social norms. Terkourafi (2008) states that impoliteness occurs when the expression

used is not conventionalized relative to the context of occurrence; it threatens the addressee's face, but no face-threatening intention is attributed to the speaker by the hearer. It means impoliteness occurs when the addressee feels offended and shows a different facial expression, but this does not exactly happen. The addressee does not feel anything and keeps quiet even though he has been attacked. Bousfield and Locher (2008) posit that impoliteness in language is impolite behavior, which is face-aggravating in a particular context.

Culpeper (2011) provides the following operationalization and definition for impoliteness: "Impoliteness is a negative attitude towards specific behaviors occurring in specific contexts." It is preserved by stereotypes, desires, and/or beliefs about the structure of society, particularly regarding how individuals' or groups' identities are shaped through social interaction. When someone acts differently from what they want, think they should be, or expect, it is viewed unfavorably and called "impolite." These kinds of actions either offend or are thought to cause offense, which means they always have the potential to, or are presumed to, have an emotional effect on one or more parties. Several factors can contribute to how offensive an impolite behavior is viewed, including whether or not it is thought to be highly purposeful. He also defines impoliteness as a situation where a speaker communicates face-attack intentionally, or when the hearer perceives and/or constructs behavior as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of both.

In similar vein with Culpeper (2011), other scholars also define impoliteness with the term of rudeness as: (1) The lowest common denominator [underlying definitions of impoliteness from Bousfield and Locher (2008) can be summarized like this: Impoliteness is behavior that is face-aggravating in a particular context, (2) [rude behavior] does not utilize politeness strategies where they would be expected, in such a way that the utterance can only almost plausibly be interpreted as intentionally and negatively confrontational (Lakoff, 1989), (3) ... rudeness is defined as a face threatening act (FTA) –or feature of an FTA such as intonation –which violates a socially sanctioned norm of interaction of the social context in which it occurs (Beebe, 1995), (4) ... marked rudeness or rudeness proper occurs when the expression used is not

conventionalized relative to the context of occurrence; following recognition of the speaker's face-threatening intention by the hearer, marked rudeness threatens the addressee's face ... impoliteness occurs when the expression used is not conventionalized relative to the context of occurrence; it threatens the addressee's face ... but no face threatening intention is attributed to the speaker by the hearer (Terkourafi, 2008), (5) ... impoliteness constitutes the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening acts (FTAs) which are purposefully delivered: (1) unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/or, (2) with deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, 'boosted', or maximized in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted (Bousfield, 2008).

Culpeper (1996) builds a framework for impoliteness in relation to the politeness strategies suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987). He proposed a model of five impoliteness strategies, with one revision developed in 2005. Those five strategies are Bald on record impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness, and Withhold politeness. Another issue related to impoliteness strategies deals with the functions of impoliteness strategies, which are proposed by Culpeper (2011) in his up-to-date book, *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offense*. There are three functions of impoliteness: Affective Impoliteness, Coercive Impoliteness, and Entertaining Impoliteness. Meanwhile, after the utterance of an impolite act performed, researchers tend to put attention on the recipient of the face threat. Culpeper et al. (2003) point out that it is important for people to look at the response to an impoliteness act due to it being related to how far that impoliteness act influences the recipient. Bousfield (2008) states that there are three kinds of responses to a face-threatening act (FTA) or impoliteness for the recipient, i.e., accepting the face attack, countering the face attack, and choosing not to respond.

The use of impoliteness in debate can ruin the essential meaning of debate, which is supposed to present an idea and give another strong opinion on vision and mission. The use of impoliteness in front of the public without good skill and without correct prediction is risky. It causes citizens to hate the politician, and they will not vote for him.

It is a dangerous effect of impoliteness strategies.

Therefore, a number of researchers conducted pragmatic studies on impoliteness issues. For instance, one study of Impoliteness Strategies used by Governor Candidates of DKI Jakarta in Governor Election Debate 2017 conducted by Siburian et al. (2019). The study discovered three out of five impoliteness strategies in Culpeper's theory: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. The most frequently impoliteness strategies used were positive impoliteness. In addition, another study conducted by Joan Lucky (2015) stated as follows: (1) All types of impoliteness strategies are used by the characters in Sherlock. Negative impoliteness is the most dominant type of impoliteness strategy, while withhold politeness is the least frequent strategy to occur in this research. (2) The characters in Sherlock frequently employed impoliteness strategies with a coercive impoliteness function. (3) In Sherlock, countering face attack by defensive strategy is the most frequently used response by the characters. The characters choose to use this response because they tend to defend their faces from the face attack.

Moreover, in another study conducted by Mirhosseini et al. (2017), the most frequent impoliteness strategy is the positive impoliteness strategy, which damages interlocutors' positive face. A study by Kadhum and Abbas (2021) has concluded that positive impoliteness is the most dominant type of impoliteness, followed by withholding politeness. The characters in The Marva Collins mostly employ affective impoliteness rather than the other functions of impoliteness. In addition, the results of another study by Anshari et al. (2023) show three functions of impoliteness strategies found, and the most dominant function used by the customers is affective impoliteness, which accounts for 62%. Affective impoliteness is an emotional outburst, such as anger/indignation, that is caused by an impolite utterance. Another researcher (Rahman & Johan, 2023) found that, in terms of the functions of impoliteness, the dominant use is affective impoliteness according to the rude behavior in the Australian restaurant "Karen's Dinner."

Many studies have indeed examined impoliteness strategies, but they only focused on the types and functions of impoliteness strategies, leaving the responses to the

impoliteness acts unaddressed. Hence, considering the importance of examining impoliteness strategies, this research examines impoliteness strategies used by three candidates: Muhaimin Iskandar, Gibran Rakabuming, and Mahfud MD. This research analyzes the debate video of the 2nd Debate of vice-presidential candidates from YouTube. Three aims of this study; they are: (1) to find out the types of impoliteness strategies used in the debate, (2) to describe the functions of impoliteness strategies used in the debate, (3) to identify the candidates' responses toward the impoliteness strategies performed at the debate. To analyze the data, this research employs theories of impoliteness strategies from Culpeper et al. (2003) and Culpeper (2005, 2011).

METHOD

This research employed a descriptive qualitative method as it focused on describing the social phenomenon in detail. Creswell (2014) states that qualitative research is an analytical process based on diverse methodological traditions of inquiry that examines a social or human phenomenon. The goal of the descriptive method is to describe and interpret the phenomenon. Therefore, this method is appropriate because the research objectives were to examine the impoliteness strategies in vice-presidential candidates' interactions in detail.

Procedures of Data Collection

The data source of this research was taken from the video on Kompas TV Sukabumi (2024) YouTube with the title "Ronde 4! Debat Cawapres 2024 Muhaimin Iskandar, Gibran Rakabuming, dan Mahfud MD". It's the second debate for vice-presidential candidates in 21st of January with the theme "*Pembangunan Berkelanjutan, Sumber Daya Alam, Lingkungan Hidup, Energi, Pangan, Agraria, Masyarakat Adat dan Desa*" on the YouTube platform, in two hours. This was one of the debate series for presidential and vice-presidential candidates. There were 5 videos for debate, 3 videos for presidential candidates and 2 videos for the vice-presidential candidates' debate. This video was chosen due to the controversy in TV news and social media about impolite acts that happened during the debate. This video was expected to be rich in data about

impoliteness strategies used in debate among politicians.

The process of collecting the data took several steps, such as watching and listening to the debate video on YouTube, then transcribing the video into written texts, highlighting the video transcriptions from YouTube based on the theory, and then analyzing the data by the types, functions, and responses.

Procedures of Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed by using Culpeper's (2011) theory of impoliteness strategies and the steps of analysis following Miles et al. (2014) analysis model, which considers three steps, namely 1) data condensation, 2) data display, and 3) conclusion drawing and verification. Data analysis was conducted as follows:

Data Condensation

Data condensation refers to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and/or transforming the data that appear in the full corpus (body) of written-up field notes, interview transcripts, documents, and other empirical materials. By condensing, we're making data stronger (Miles et al., 2014). In data condensation, the researcher reduces information to only the statements that are considered to use one of the impoliteness strategies. The researcher eliminates data that do not support the use of impoliteness strategies from the whole conversation in the debate.

Data Display

A display is an organized, compressed assembly of information that allows conclusion drawing and action (Miles et al., 2014). In this step, the researcher organized and displayed the data from the transcribed 2nd Debate of Vice Presidents video from YouTube. The data has to be selected to support the analysis of the use of impoliteness strategies. As the second component in analyzing data, this technique is used to arrange the information, description, or narration to conclude.

Conclusion and Verification

Conclusion drawing is the third element of qualitative analysis. It involves stepping back to consider what the analyzed data mean and to assess their implications for the questions at hand (Miles et al., 2014). Verification, integrally linked to conclusion drawing,

entails revisiting the data as many times as necessary to cross-check or verify the emergent conclusions. In this step, after conducting data condensation and data display, the researcher concludes, and verification starts from data collection until data analysis by taking the points that refer to the formulation of research questions. After concluding, the next step is verification by going back to the field notes, with argumentation and review.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In the *Vice President 2nd Debate Video*, the researcher analyzed the different ways in which Candidate 01) Muhaimin Iskandar, Candidate 02) Gibran Rakabuming Raka, and Candidate 03) Mahfud MD, the three candidates, employed impolite acts. The findings of the study are presented in three different parts. The first part presents the findings on the types of impoliteness strategies performed by the three candidates. It is then followed by the explanation of findings on the functions of the impoliteness strategies used by the three candidates in the second part. Finally, the third part shows the findings on the responses of the three candidates toward the impoliteness acts in the debate.

Types of impoliteness strategies performed by the three candidates

The results of the analysis in the second debate of the presidential election with three candidates discovered that there were five types of impoliteness strategies performed by the three candidates as follows: Bald on Record Impoliteness 30%, Negative Impoliteness 22.5%, Positive Impoliteness 22.5%, Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness 22.5%, Withhold Politeness 2.5% (see Table 1).

Table 1

Types of Impoliteness Strategies

Types	Frequency	Percentage
Bald on Record Impoliteness	12	30%
Negative Impoliteness	9	22.5%
Positive Impoliteness	9	22.5%
Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness	9	22.5%
Withhold Politeness	1	2.5%
Total	40	100

The most dominant strategy used in the debate is Bald on Record Impoliteness due to the candidates mostly attacking the other candidates in a direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way. The other three types of impoliteness strategies are found with the same frequency.

Bald on Record Impoliteness

Bald on record impoliteness is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way, and the speaker intends to attack the hearer's face. A revised version of this strategy in Culpeper takes into consideration that, in this case, there is a lot of face at stake and the speaker intends to attack the hearer's face, or in situations when the speaker cannot (safely) say an offensive or impolite utterance. He has categorized the realization of bald on record impoliteness into 1) direct, 2) clear, 3) unambiguous, and 4) concise ways. Here are the examples of data found as Bald on Record Impoliteness:

Data 1:

O1: *Terima kasih Pak Gibran, yang Anda sampaikan hanya mengulang apa yang saya sampaikan.*

O1: Thank you, Mr. Gibran, for what you just said, it's simply repeating what I just said earlier.

From the data, Candidate 01 responded to Candidate 02's previous statement, who said, "*enak banget ya Gus ya jawabnya sambil baca catatan tadi*". [That's good Gus as you answered it by reading the notes that you've prepared]. Candidate 01 personally considered Candidate 02's statement for attacking him. Therefore, he attacked Candidate 02 back on the debate stage by saying that Candidate 02 was just repeating what he had already said before. He was not using offensive words; he just performed the utterance in a direct, clear, and concise way.

Data 2:

O3: *Pak Muhaimin di meja saya itu ada tumbler, tulisannya "no one left behind" jangan ada satupun yang tertinggal, dan itu yang saya lakukan. Kalau bapak tadi katakan "jangan ada yang tertinggal dong semua dilibatkan", itu yang tadi saya putuskan.*

O3: Mr. Muhaimin, on that desk there's my tumbler, it's written "no one left behind" and that's what I did. If you were saying "don't leave anyone

behind, everyone should be involved”, that’s what I decided.

Candidate O3 responded to Candidate O1’s statement, who said, “*Jangan ada yang tertinggal dong semua dilibatkan*. [Don’t leave anyone behind, everyone should be involved]. He responded to it by presenting a fact that he had said that he decided to involve everyone and leave no one behind, as stated above in his tumbler. He directly called Candidate O1’s name clearly “*Pak Muhaimin*” and clearly conveyed that Candidate O1’s statement was delivered by him earlier at the debate.

Data 3:

O2: *Loh, katanya tidak menjawab pertanyaan, tapi Gus Muhaimin malah ngomongin pemerataan pembangunan. Itu kan tadi yang saya omongin, Gus.*

O2: You said it wasn’t answering the question, but Gus Muhaimin instead talked about equitable development, which is what I was talking about, Gus.

Candidate O2 directly mentioned Candidate O1 to attack him because he had already answered Candidate O1’s question, but Candidate O1 said it was not the answer. Mentioning Candidate O1 “Gus” directly and the reason clearly are considered realizations of bald-on-record impoliteness.

Based on the data samples above, as mentioned by Culpeper (2005), the strategy Bald on Record Impoliteness is when someone performs an impolite act, and it does not use offensive words but attacks someone with the realizations in a direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way. The data analysis revealed that the candidates used the realizations performed in the utterances. It indicates that the candidates used to perform the utterances in debate, directly mentioning the names of other candidates and delivering the utterances explicitly. They directly attack each other’s faces with unambiguous utterances. They used this strategy to indicate that they have clear reasons and the bravery to attack another candidate.

Negative Impoliteness

Negative impoliteness is a strategy used to attack the hearer’s negative face. This approach is used by the speaker to damage the recipient’s freedom of action. Brown and

Levinson (1987) define negative face as an individual’s desire not to have their basic rights and freedoms impeded by others. Meanwhile, a positive face involves a desire to be connected to others; a negative face desires autonomy (a person’s ability to act on their own interests). The realizations are: 1) frighten, 2) condescend, scorn, or ridicule, 3) invade the other’s space, 4) explicitly associate the other with the negative aspect, 5) put the other’s indebtedness on record.

Data 1:

O2: *Baik terima kasih, enak banget ya Gus ya? Jawabnya sambil baca catatan tadi.*

O2: Alright thank you, isn’t it good Gus? You answered it by reading the notes that you’ve prepared.

Candidate O2 started to be ridiculous to Candidate O1 by explicitly associating Candidate O1 with a negative aspect, which is reading the notes to perform in the debate, and considered it a privilege that was not right on the debate stage. He clearly invaded Candidate O2’s space by exposing Candidate O1’s personal notes for the debate.

Data 2:

O2: *Gus Muhaimin ini lucu ya, menanyakan masalah lingkungan hidup tapi itu kok pakai botol-botol plastik itu. Padahal saya, Pak Ganjar, Prof. Mahfud pakai botol kaca itu gimana itu komitmennya botol plastik semua itu?*

O2: Gus Muhaimin is funny, asking about environmental issues but why you’re the one using the plastic bottle. Meanwhile Mr. Ganjar, Prof. Mahfud, and I use the glass bottles. How could that be the commitment while still using plastic bottle?]

Candidate O2 was ridiculous to Candidate O1 about the fact that Candidate O1 explained about the health environment, but he was also the only one who used a plastic bottle compared to other candidates that mentioned “*saya, Pak Ganjar, Prof. Mahfud*”. [Mr. Ganjar, Prof. Mahfud, and I]. Candidate O2 used negative impoliteness in this utterance with three realizations, which are: 1) condescend, scorn, or ridicule, 2) invade the other’s space, and 3) explicitly associate the other with the negative aspect.

Based on the data samples above, as mentioned by Culpeper (2005), the strategy

of Negative Impoliteness is used when someone performs an impolite act to attack others with the five realizations. The researcher found that the data sample analysis revealed three out of five realizations, which are 1) condescend, scorn, or ridicule, 2) invade the other's space, and 3) explicitly associate the other with the negative aspect. It indicates that the candidates used this strategy to focus on attacking other candidates' faces with negative utterances.

Positive Impoliteness

Positive impoliteness is a strategy directed to attack the hearer's positive face. Brown and Levinson (1987) characterized positive face be desire to be liked, admired, ratified, and related to positively, nothing that one would threaten positive face by ignoring someone possible positive impoliteness realizations: 1) ignore, snub the other, 2) exclude the other from an activity, 3) disassociate from the other, 4) be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic, 5) use inappropriate identity markers, 6) use obscure or secretive language, 7) seek disagreement, 8) make other feel uncomfortable, 9) use taboo words, and 10) demand other names –use negative appointments.

Data 1:

O1: *Pertanyaan saya tidak terjawab sama sekali karena di undang-undang kita juga dinyatakan bahwa potensi bioregional kita itu adalah bahwa wilayah nasional kita itu bukan terbagi bukan saja sekedar karena politik dan administrasi tetapi ekosistem lingkungannya ada sekaligus juga komunitas masyarakat yang tumbuh juga menjadi pertimbangan.*

O1: **My question wasn't answered at all** because our law also states that our bioregional potential is that our national territory is **not divided** only because of politics and administration but the existing environmental ecosystem as well as the growing community are also taken into consideration.

Candidate O1 disagreed with Candidate O2's answer to his question; thus, he said Candidate O2's answer did not actually answer his question. In addition, Candidate O1 also disagreed with Candidate O2's statement and corrected it. By saying the word "*bukan*" [not], it clearly meant to

disagree and indicated that Candidate O2 was not correct. It was considered positive impoliteness with the intention to snub the other candidate and seek disagreement.

Data 2:

O1: *Sekali lagi, intinya bukan hanya etika lingkungan tetapi etika bahwa forum ini adalah forum policy yang berharga. Jangan-jangan kalau kita tebak-tebakkan definisi di sini, saya ragu kita ini levelnya SD/SMP atau jangan-jangan ijazah kita palsu semua di sini. Ini yang mengagetkan. Jadi kalau tebak-tebakan ya bukan di sini levelnya; di sini adalah kebijakan kita untuk memimpin negara.*

O1: Once again, the point isn't just the environmental ethics instead the ethics that this forum is a valuable policy forum. If we were here to guess at the definition, I wonder if we're the elementary/junior high school level, or even our diplomas are all fake. This is what's surprising. So, if we're guessing, it's not our level here; it's our policy for leading the country.

Candidate O1 disagreed with Candidate O2's statement about the environment. He also emphasized and corrected the point that made Candidate O2 feel uncomfortable. It is considered positive impoliteness with the intention to seek disagreement, snub the other candidate, and make the other feel uncomfortable.

Based on the data samples above, as mentioned by Culpeper (2005), the strategy Positive Impoliteness is used when someone performs an impolite act to attack others with the ten realizations, and the data samples analysis revealed that the most used realization for this strategy is to seek disagreement. The candidates used to seek *disagreement* with the other candidate's answers in debate to attack them that their ideas did not relate to the questions. It also indicates that the candidates wanted to attack other candidates' faces by snubbing others by correcting the utterances after they showed disagreement.

Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness

Culpeper (2005) states that sarcasm or mock impoliteness is performed with the use of politeness strategies that clearly remain surface realizations. In this case, someone uses this strategy as following a threatened

face done by applying politeness strategies that are actually just pretending. In addition, Culpeper's (2005) theory of sarcasm or mock impoliteness is close to Leech's conception of irony: "If you must cause offense, at least do so in a way which does not overtly conflict with the PP, but allows the hearer to arrive at the offensive point of your remark indirectly, by way of an implicature".

Data 1:

O1: *Saya catat sedikit, yang penting ini bukan catatan Mahkamah Konstitusi.*

O1: I'll take a few notes, the important thing is that these aren't Constitutional Court's notes.

Candidate O1 delivered a judgment about a controversial case between Candidate O2 and *Mahkamah Konstitusi*, where Candidate O2 can be a candidate in the presidential election with the help of his relative power. He emphasized it to mock him and attack his face by saying offensive utterances.

Data 2:

O2: *Saya lagi nyari jawabannya Prof. Mahfud. Saya nyari-nyari dimana ini jawabannya, kok gak ketemu jawabannya. Saya tanya masalah inflasi hijau, kok malah menjelaskan ekonomi hijau.*

O2: I'm looking for the answer from Prof. Mahfud. I've been looking for the answer but I can't find it. I asked about green inflation issue, but instead he's explaining the green economy.

Candidate O2 clearly attacked Candidate O3 with offensive utterances that show Candidate O3 was not capable of answering his question: "*Saya tanya masalah inflasi hijau, kok malah menjelaskan ekonomi hijau.*" [I asked about the green inflation issue, but instead you explained about the green economy.]

Based on the data sample above, it can be seen, as mentioned in Culpeper (2005), that the strategy Sarcasm and Mock Impoliteness is used to attack others' face by pretending to use politeness strategies, but in fact the candidates just want to attack others' faces with offensive utterances. It indicates that the candidates used this strategy to underestimate other candidates' skill and knowledge, such as considering

other candidates are not capable of answering the question in the debate.

Withhold Politeness

Culpeper (2005) explains withhold impoliteness occurs when someone prefers to keep silent when a polite act is hoped to be performed by others. The realization of withholding impoliteness is being silent and failing to say thank you.

Data 1:

O3: *Ini gak layak dijawab pertanyaan kayak gini, gak ada ini jawabannya. Terima kasih, saya kembalikan (ke moderator) gak ada gunanya menjawab.*

O3: This kind of question isn't worth answering, there's no answer to this. Thank you, I'll give it back (to the moderator). There's no point in answering that.

The realization of withholding impoliteness is being silent and failing to thank for the question that has been given by Candidate O2. Candidate O3 did not want to answer Candidate O2's question because he personally considered it a silly question that was not supposed to be answered.

In relation to previous studies, the result of this present study, which has Bald on Record Impoliteness as the dominant strategy used, is not aligned with the previous studies. The previous studies have positive impoliteness and negative impoliteness as the most dominant strategies used (Kadhum & Abbas, 2021; Mirhosseini et al., 2017; Siburian et al., 2019). They discovered positive impoliteness as the frequent strategy used. Meanwhile, JoanLucky (2015) conducted research on negative impoliteness as the dominant type of impoliteness strategy. This indicates that the results of this study are different due to the candidates performing utterances mostly in a direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way. They tend to call the name of other candidates directly to emphasize that they attack explicitly, with the courage to attack the hearer's face.

Functions of the Impoliteness Strategies used by the three candidates

The results of the analysis of the second debate of the presidential election with three candidates reveal that there are three functions of impoliteness strategies as

follows: Affective Impoliteness 52.5%, Coercive Impoliteness 40%, Entertaining Impoliteness 7.5% (see Table 2).

Table 2

Functions of Impoliteness Strategies

Functions	Frequency	Percentage
Affective Impoliteness	21	52.5%
Coercive Impoliteness	16	40%
Entertaining Impoliteness	3	7.5%
Total	40	100

Based on the analysis, it is shown that the most dominant strategy used in the debate is Affective Impoliteness because the candidates tend to make emotional outbursts at the other candidates in the debate.

Affective Impoliteness

The first function of impoliteness is treated as emotional impoliteness. This role includes an emotional outburst during a conversation between the speaker and the hearer. Culpeper (2011) claims that affective impoliteness shows an excessively heightened feeling, such as indignation, which implies the duty of the goal to produce a negative emotional state. This utterance conventionalizes impoliteness insults, and this is clarified with a negative value. The data collected that are considered affective impoliteness are 21 data points, and here are the samples from the data collected.

Data 1:

O3: *Saya juga ingin mencari tu jawabannya, ngawur juga itu. Gila ini ngarang-ngarang gak karuan mengkait-kaitkan dengan sesuatu yang tidak ada gitu ya.*

O3: I also want to find the answer, it's also nonsense. It's crazy, this is just making up nonsense that linking it to something that doesn't exist.

Candidate O3 directly reciprocates the way Candidate O2 intimidates him by saying similar statements to those spoken by Candidate O2 previously, "Saya juga mencari tu jawabannya...". [I also want to find the answer.] He was also saying several offensive words such as *ngawur*, *gila*, *gak karuan*.

Data 2:

O3: *Begini loh, kalau akademis itu gampangnya kalau bertanya yang*

kayak gitu-gitu tuh. Recehan gitu, recehan, recehan. Oleh sebab itu itu tidak layak dijawab menurut saya dan oleh sebab itu saya kembalikan saja ke moderator.

O3: Listen, in academics, it's easy to ask questions like that. It's silly, silly, silly. Therefore, in my opinion, it's not worth answering it, and therefore, I'll just give this back to the moderator.

Candidate O3 considered Candidate O2's question a silly question. He said the offensive word "recehan" three times and made an excuse that the question was not supposed to be answered.

Data 3:

O2: *Ini agak aneh ya. Yang sering ngomongin LFP itu timsesnya tapi cawapresnya gak paham lfp itu apa, kan aneh. Sering bicara "LFP LFP lithium ferofosfat, Tesla enggak pakai nikel", ini kan kebohongan publik.*

O2: This is a bit strange. The campaign team often talks about LFP, but the vice-presidential candidate doesn't understand what LFP is, it's strange. They often say "LFP is lithium ferrophosphate, Tesla doesn't use nickel, which is a public lie.

Candidate O2 was indicated to be ridiculous by invading Candidate O1's space and demanded Candidate O1 and his supporters "timses" by negative words "aneh" [strange].

Based on the data samples, this function is the dominant one used in the debate. As mentioned by Culpeper (2011) that the affective impoliteness shows emotion followed by negative words to make others feel the emotion. The data show that offensive words are performed as they want to make the other candidates angry. It indicates that the candidates used negative utterances to attack other candidates' faces, used offensive words, and made other candidates uncomfortable within the emotional situation.

Coercive Impoliteness

Coerciveness is uncomfortable when values are rearranged between the supplier and the aim, in which the manufacturer gains more or is strengthened or covered by their existing advantages (Culpeper, 2011). The terms producer and objective here may not only be

used for individuals but also groups or organizations. This role seems to arise in circumstances where there is a different social systemic force or social condition, according to Culpeper (2011). The data collected that are considered affective impoliteness are 16 data points, and here are the examples from the data collected.

Data 1:

O2: *Loh katanya tidak menjawab pertanyaan tapi Gus Muhaimin malah ngomongin pemerataan pembangunan, itu kan tadi yang saya omongin Gus.*

O2: Hey, he said I didn't answer the question but Gus Muhaimin instead talked about the equitable development, that's what I was talking about, Gus.

Candidate O2 directly mentioned Candidate O1, "Gus" to attack him about his statement, which only repeated what Candidate O2 said first. It is shown that Candidate O2 was being rude to Candidate O1 by recognizing that he was only repeating what he said.

Data 2:

O2: *Mungkin itu kan mungkin dapat contekan itu dari Pak Tom Lembong, mungkin ya.*

O2: Probably, he got the cheat sheet from Mr. Tom Lembong, maybe.

Candidate O2 ridiculed Candidate O1 for not being capable of answering his question by demanding other names and explicitly associating him with the negative aspect "dapat contekan".

Data 3:

O2: *Tapi sekali lagi, ini harus kita evaluasi dan kita jangan memberikan narasi-narasi yang menakutkan kepada warga. Intinya adalah program-program yang sudah berjalan sekarang, nomor 1 dan nomor 3 ini kan kompak food estate gagal.*

O2: But once again, we should evaluate this, and we shouldn't present the frightening narratives to public. The point is programs which are currently on going, candidates O1 and O3, are still focusing on the failed food estate program.

Candidate O2 talked about his opinion directly, mentioning other candidates "nomor

1 dan nomor 3" [Candidates O1 and O3]. The utterance defined Candidate O1 and Candidate O3 should agree with his statement.

Entertaining Impoliteness

The ultimate role of impoliteness is entertaining. The purpose or the possible objective of impoliteness, including entertainment, is to manipulate this role of impoliteness (Culpeper, 2011). In entertaining impoliteness, the addressee entertains the hearer and enjoys the feeling of amusement. It's unforeseen that even though it appears to hurt or anger people, it can be fun. Unlike other pragmatic experiments with a dyad of speakers and audiences, impoliteness can be organized similarly for both the listening crowd and the target audience (Culpeper, 2011). The data collected that are considered entertaining impoliteness are 3 data as follows.

Data 1:

O2: *Nah gitu dong Gus, jangan terlalu tegang kaya waktu debat cawapres pertama kemarin.*

O2: That's good Gus, don't be too nervous like during the first vice-presidential debate yesterday.

Candidate O2 underestimated Candidate O1's performance in the previous debate but turned it into a joke and said it with a little laugh.

Data 2:

O2: *Saya lagi nyari jawabannya Prof. Mahfud, saya nyari-nyari dimana ini jawabannya, kok gak ketemu jawabannya. Saya tanya masalah inflasi hijau kok malah menjelaskan ekonomi hijau.*

O2: I'm looking for the answer from Prof. Mahfud. I've been looking for the answer but I can't find it. I asked about green inflation issue, but instead he's explaining the green economy.

Candidate O2 clearly attacked Candidate O3 with offensive statements that showed Candidate O3 was not capable of answering his question. On the other hand, he delivered it with fun gestures to mock Candidate O3.

Data 3:

O2: *Sepertinya Prof. Mahfud agak ngambek ya, soalnya saya sudah dua*

kali memberikan pertanyaan yang sulit, carbon capture, greenflation, selalu dikomenin pertanyaan receh. Ya kalau receh ya dijawab pak gitu loh, gampang itu.

O2: It seems like Prof Mahfud is a bit sulky, because I have asked him difficult questions twice, carbon capture, greenflation, and he always comments that those are silly questions. If you think it's silly, then answer it, it's that easy.

Candidate O2 made the assumption "agak ngambek" [a bit sulky] and said it with a little laugh to mock Candidate O3, who always said that Candidate O2 made a silly question, "pertanyaan receh".

The result of the study shows that affective impoliteness is the most frequently used to respond to the impolite acts of other candidates, followed by coercive impoliteness, and the least is entertaining impoliteness. This aligns with the results of Anshari et al. (2023), Kadhum and Abbas (2021), and Rahman and Johan (2023)'s results of their studies, showing that Affective Impoliteness is the most dominant function since there were utterances that made emotional outbursts, such as anger, in the conversation. However, a study by JoanLucky (2015) has a different result, which is that Coercive Impoliteness comes as the dominant impoliteness function. It indicates that the candidates used coerciveness in their utterances to force others to acknowledge their ideas.

Candidates' responses toward the impoliteness acts in the debate

The result of this study reveals, as mentioned by Culpeper et al. (2003), that there are three kinds of responses for a recipient to a face-threatening act (FTA) or impoliteness acts as follows: Accepting the Face Attack (12.5%), Countering the Face Attack (75%), and Choosing not to Respond (12.5%).

Table 3
Responses toward the Impoliteness Acts

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Accepting the face attack	2	12.5%
Countering the face attack	12	75 %
Choosing not to respond	2	12.5%
Total	16	100

The results from the data showed that countering the face attack is dominant, with 12 occurrences identified in the data. This aligns with JoanLucky (2015)'s result of the study, which identified countering the face attack as the frequently used response.

Accepting the Face Attack

For the participants who choose to accept the face attack, it can be assumed that they take some kind of responsibility for the impoliteness act to happen. It is also possible that they may agree with the impolite assessment contained within the exacerbated FTA (Bousfield, 2008).

Data 1:

O3: Ada orang (O1) yang mengatakan aturannya kan sudah ada tinggal laksanakan tidak semudah itu, ... karena kalau jawabannya (O1) laksanakan aturan itu normatif.

O3: There's a person (O1) who say that the rules already exist, it just needs to be implemented, but it's not that easy, ... because if the answer (O1) is implementing the rules is normative.

O1: Saya kira Pak Mahfud, apa yang saya sampaikan tadi bisa berjalan dengan lancar problem-problem bisa diatasi dengan baik.

O1: I think Mr. Mahfud, what I said earlier can run smoothly and the issues can be resolved efficiently.

Candidate O1 accepted what Candidate O3 had said without attacking back. Candidate O3 responded to the answer of Candidate O1, who said, "aturannya kan sudah ada tinggal laksanakan" [the rules already exist, it just needs to be implemented], and Candidate O1 responded to Candidate O3 by continuing the statements without any defense.

Data 2:

O2: Intinya ada negara yang gak mau pakai nikel. Itu loh Gus yang saya maksud. Apakah Gus Muhaiminin juga anti nikel seperti Pak Tom Lembong?

O2: The point is our country doesn't want to use nickel. That's what I meant, Gus. Is Gus Muhaiminin also the person who's anti-nickel as Tom Lembong?

O1: Saya setuju bahwa potensi sumber daya alam kita harus terus kita promosikan. Tetapi harap dicatat gara-gara kita mengeksplorasi nikel ugul-

ugalan lalu hilirisasi tanpa mempertimbangkan ekologi mempertimbangkan sosialnya.

O1: I agree that we should continue to promote the potential of our natural resources. However, please note that we're recklessly exploring nickel and then downstreaming it without considering the ecology and social aspects.

Candidate O1 agreed with Candidate O2 by clearly saying "*saya setuju*" [I agree] and continued with the explanation without attacking back at Candidate O2, who mocked him by calling another person who was not on the debate stage "*Pak Tom Lembong*".

Countering the Face Attack

Countering the face attack happens when someone counters the face attack from others; they do not just keep silent, as it looks like they agree with the face attack.

Data 1:

O1: *Antara proyek pembangunan nasional terutama PSN dengan masyarakat adat kita harus betul-betul punya prinsip tidak ada satu pun yang ditinggalkan dalam mengambil keputusan.*

O1: Between the national development program, especially the PSN, and our indigenous people, we should truly have the principle that no one is left behind when making decisions.

O3: *Pak Muhaimin, di meja saya itu ada tumbler; tulisannya "no one left behind, jangan ada satu pun yang tertinggal", dan itu yang saya lakukan. Kalau Bapak tadi katakan "jangan ada yang tertinggal dong semua dilibatkan", itu yang tadi saya putuskan.*

O3: Mr. Muhaimin, on that desk there's my tumbler, it's written "no one left behind" and that's what I did. If you were saying "don't leave anyone behind, everyone should be involved", that's what I decided.

Candidate O3 attacked Candidate O1 by answering his statement with sarcasm "*kalau tadi Bapak katakan... itu yang tadi saya putuskan,*" he said he had already talked about the statement earlier than Candidate O1.

Data 2:

O1: *Pertanyaan saya tidak terjawab sama sekali.*

O1: My question wasn't answered at all.

O2: *Itu tadi kan sudah saya jawab, Gus. Mungkin Gus Muhaimin juga tidak paham dengan pertanyaan yang diberikan ke saya. Mungkin itu kan mungkin dapat contekan itu dari Pak Tom Lembong mungkin ya.*

O2: I have answered it, Gus. Probably, Gus Muhaimin also didn't understand the question I was given. Maybe he got the cheat sheet from Mr. Tom Lembong, maybe.

Candidate O1 said Candidate O2 did not answer his question properly. Then, Candidate O2 attacked him back by confirming he was answering the question and making the assumption that Candidate O1 lacked understanding of his own question.

Data 3:

O3: *Mas Gibran, saya menghormati Anda sebagai calon wakil presiden sehingga saya tidak akan bicara secara menjabek dan receh-receh.*

O3: Mr. Gibran, I respect you as a vice president candidate, so I won't talk to trap and in a silly way.

O2: *Sepertinya Prof. Mahfud agak ngambek ya, ... selalu dikomenin pertanyaan receh, ya kalau receh ya dijawab pak gitu loh, segampang itu.*

O2: It seems like Prof. Mahfud is a bit sulky, ... always comments that those are silly questions. If you think it's silly, then answer it, it's that easy.

Candidate O2 mocked Candidate O3, who was considered offended "*ngambek*" by his question. At first, Candidate O3 also mocked Candidate O2, who was giving him a silly question by saying "*receh*".

Choosing Not to Respond

Bousfield (2008) argues that choosing not to respond might be caused by several reasons or that there are intended participant aims within a conversational exchange, including defending one's own face. Other reasons suggested by Bousfield (2008, p. 188) include the participant's failure to hear the content of the speaker's utterance, the participant's acceptance of the FTA, or the participant's lack of understanding of the content of the utterance. It is also possible

that the participant does not know how to respond to the impolite act.

Data 1:

O2: *Enak banget ya Gus ya? jawabnya sambil baca catatan tadi.*

O2: Isn't it good Gus? You answered it by reading the notes that you've prepared.

O1: ***Terima kasih Pak Gibran yang Anda sampaikan hanya mengulang apa yang saya sampaikan.***

O1: **Thank you, Mr. Gibran, for what you just said, it's simply repeating what I just said earlier.**

Candidate O1 said thanks and continued without responding to the point of Candidate O2 that ridiculed Candidate O1 read a note for answering a question "*jawabnya sambil baca catatan*".

Data 2:

O2: *Ini agak aneh ya, yang sering ngomongin LFP itu timesnya tapi cawapresnya gak paham lfp itu apa, kan aneh. Sering bicara "LFP LFP lithium ferofosfat, Tesla enggak pakai nikel", ini kan kebohongan publik.*

O2: This is a bit strange. The campaign team often talks about LFP, but the vice-presidential candidate doesn't understand what LFP is, it's strange. They often say "LFP is lithium ferrophosphate, Tesla doesn't use nickel, which is a public lie.

O1: *(tidak menjawab asumsi O2 yang mengatakan O1 tidak paham LFP)*

O1: (O1 doesn't answer anything about O2's assumption that O1 doesn't understand LFP)

Candidate O1 did not respond to the point of Candidate O2's assumption, "*ini kan kebohongan publik*" [this is a public lie], to underestimate Candidate O1.

Based on the data samples above, the candidates frequently counter the face attack since it is crucial for debate, and it was an effective strategy for defending from face attacks in debate. They need to have the power to respond by attacking other candidates' faces. Moreover, choosing not to respond to the face attack is the least strategy that was used by the candidates. Only Candidate O3 chose not to respond to the attacks of Candidate O2. He thought that it would be useless to respond to Candidate O2's utterances or that he did not know how to respond to Candidate O2's face attack.

CONCLUSION

This research examines the types, functions, and responses of impoliteness strategies. Based on the findings, for the types of impoliteness strategies, the most dominant type is Bald on Record Impoliteness. It is shown that on the debate stage, candidates tend to attack other candidates with a direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise statement. Moreover, the most dominant function is affective impoliteness; it shows that the most frequent candidates attack others to make them angry or produce a negative emotion. On the other hand, the responses to impoliteness strategies used among candidates differ in three ways. The most frequently used is countering the face attack. It is shown that the candidates used to defend their face from the attack and respond to the impoliteness strategies of other candidates by attacking them back.

In conclusion, this research showed that the use of impoliteness strategies for politicians in debate can be impactful for citizens to determine which candidate will be supported. Moreover, citizens tend to look at each candidate's performance in a debate; the one who used impoliteness strategies seems to be hated by citizens, and netizens mostly feel sympathetic to the loser in the debate stage. The phenomenon of impoliteness can be observed in everyday discourse as well as social situations. As a result, readers can be more cautious when selecting specific tactics to maintain excellent communication with others and to achieve their purpose during that communication. Moreover, hope this research will be helpful as a reference for other researchers.

REFERENCES

- Anshari, R., Husein, R., & Meisuri. (2023). The functions of impoliteness on Asia's leading airline Instagram. *Linguistik Terapan*, 20(2), 174–181.
- Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. Routledge.
<https://newuniversityinexileconsortium.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/the-language-of-politics.pdf>
- Beebe, L. M. (1995). Polite fictions: Instrumental rudeness as pragmatic competence. In J. E. Alatis, C. A. Strachle, B. Gallenberger, & M. Ronkin (Eds.), *Linguistics and the education of language teachers: Ethnolinguistic, psycholinguistics and sociolinguistic*

- aspects (pp. 154-168). Georgetown University Press.
- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction*. John Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.167>
- Bousfield, D., & Locher, M. A. (Eds.). (2008). *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice*. Mouton de Gruyter.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208344>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8(2), 286-292.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 5(1), 78-88.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35>
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offense*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511975752>
- Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspect. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 1545-1579.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00118-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00118-2)
- JoanLucky, B. (2015). *A pragmatic analysis of impoliteness strategies in British TV-series Sherlock*.
<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/33528571.pdf>
- Kadhum, M. F., & Abbas, N. F. (2021). How impoliteness is portrayed in a school context: *The Marva Collins as a case study*. *Arab World English Journal*, 12(3), 144-158.
- Kompas TV Sukabumi. (2024, January 22). *RONDE 4! Debat cawapres 2024 Muhaimin Iskandar, Gibran Rakabuming dan Mahfud MD* [Video]. YouTube.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oaP1M_JUI4A
- Lakoff, R. (1989). The limits of politeness: Therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua*, 8(2-3), 101-129.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.101>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Mirhosseini, M., Mardanshahi, M., & Dowlatabadi, H. (2017). Impoliteness strategies based on Culpeper's model: An analysis of gender differences between two characters in the movie Mother. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(3), 221-238.
- Rahman, S., & Johan, M. (2023). Types of impoliteness discovered in "Karen's Dinner" Australia. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 11(1), 854-863.
<https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v11i1.3555>
- Siburian, Y. D., Murni, S. M., & Gurning, B. (2019). Impoliteness strategies used by governor candidates of DKI Jakarta in governor election debate 2017. *Linguistik Terapan*, 16(1), 365-378.
<https://doi.org/10.24114/lt.v16i1.15727>
- Terkourafi, M. (2008). Towards a unified theory of politeness, impoliteness, and rudeness. In D. Bousfield & M. Locher (Eds.), *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice* (pp. 45-74). Mouton de Gruyter.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208344.1.45>