



## Impoliteness in the Final 2024 Indonesian Presidential Debate: Critical Discourse Analysis

Putri Melinda<sup>1</sup>, Sultan Ahmad Sitepu<sup>2</sup>, Mariah Teta br Ginting<sup>3</sup>, Amira Tsarwah Ritonga<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>English Literature, Universitas Negeri Medan

Email: melindaputri7474@gmail.com, sultanahmadsitepu178@gmail.com, mariahtetaginting23@gmail.com, amiratsr7@gmail.com

### Article Info

#### Article history :

Received : 17-06-2024

Revised : 19-06-2024

Accepted : 21-06-2024

Pulished : 23-06-2024

### Abstract

*Political debates are crucial in democratic societies, shaping public opinion and influencing voter decisions. The final 2024 Indonesian presidential debate, featuring candidates Prabowo Subianto, Anies Baswedan, and Ganjar Pranowo, highlighted the use of impoliteness, potentially impacting political communication dynamics. This study employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to investigate impoliteness strategies in the final 2024 Indonesian presidential debate. Data was transcribed from the KPU RI YouTube Channel, and Culpeper's impoliteness model guided the analysis of 35 instances of impoliteness. The results reveal that Prabowo Subianto and Ganjar Pranowo primarily use positive and negative impoliteness, while Anies Baswedan shows a preference for positive impoliteness. The findings highlight the candidates' use of impoliteness to assert views and critique opponents, underscoring the debate's confrontational nature. The findings indicate that the candidates employ impoliteness to assert their views and critique their opponents, highlighting the contentious nature of the debate.*

**Keywords:** *Discourse Analysis, impoliteness, presidential debate.*

## INTRODUCTION

Political debates have always been an integral part of democratic societies, serving as platforms for candidates to present their ideas, challenge opponents, and engage with the electorate. These debates shape public opinion, influence voter decision-making, and contribute to the overall political discourse. Presidential debates also serve as crucial platforms for candidates to present their political agendas, engage with opponents, and influence voter opinion. The final 2024 Indonesia presidential debate, a highly significant event in the electoral process, witnessed instances of impoliteness that potentially impacted the tone and dynamics of political communication. It witnessed a televised debate that tested the mettle of three contenders: Prabowo Subianto, Anies Baswedan, and Ganjar Pranowo. In the final debate, the three candidates conveyed their purpose and arguments to answer the questions given by the moderator. It shows how they use the language to express their thoughts and politics agendas to the public .



The final 2024 Indonesia presidential debate holds particular significance as the focal point of this discourse analysis. Discourse analysis (DA) is a qualitative research method that examines written, spoken, or sign language in its social context. DA studies language beyond individual sentences. It explores how language conveys meaning within specific social, cultural, political, and historical backgrounds. DA considers the broader context in which communication occurs. It goes beyond literal word meanings and looks at the overall messages conveyed.

Impoliteness, characterized by the violation of social norms governing polite behavior, has been the subject of extensive research in linguistics, communication, and sociology. Within the context of political debates, impoliteness manifests through the use of aggressive language, personal attacks, and disrespectful behavior towards opponents. Culpeper (1996) defines impoliteness as a complex phenomenon that can be expressed through various linguistic and non-linguistic means. Culpeper (1996) mentioned that impoliteness is a multifaceted phenomenon that can be expressed through various linguistic and non-linguistic means. In political debates, impoliteness can manifest in aggressive language, personal attacks, interruption, and disrespectful behavior towards opponents. As Culpeper (2011) argues, impoliteness can be strategically employed by politicians as a rhetorical device to gain advantage, discredit opponents, and appeal to certain segments of the electorate.

In their study on impoliteness strategies in political discourse, Ifechelobi and Okpokiri (2020) investigated the use of positive impoliteness in the 2011-2015 Nigerian presidential election campaign speeches. They found that politicians employed strategies such as name-calling, disassociation, and exclusion to undermine their opponents' public image, thereby inciting social conflicts and electoral violence. This research highlighted the damaging effects of impoliteness on national development and called for more responsible language use by political actors to promote peace and stability. Similarly, another study analyzed the impoliteness strategies used by Donald Trump during the 2016 U.S. presidential debates. The research identified several instances where Trump employed direct attacks, mockery, and derogatory remarks to challenge his opponents and assert dominance. These strategies not only intensified the confrontational nature of the debates but also influenced public discourse and voter attitudes. The study underscored the significant role that impolite language plays in shaping the dynamics of political debates and its potential consequences for democratic processes.

Negative impoliteness strategies encompass various tactics aimed at offending or belittling others. These strategies include instilling fear by suggesting that harmful actions will occur, condescending, scolding, or ridiculing to emphasize one's superiority, and treating the other person with contempt. This can involve belittling them through diminutives or not taking them seriously. Another strategy is invading the other's space, either literally by positioning oneself too close physically or metaphorically by asking for or discussing overly intimate information. Explicitly



associating the other with a negative aspect. Additionally, putting the other's indebtedness on record highlights how they owe you. The structure of conversation itself is sensitive to these violations, which can also be an important means of transmitting impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996).

As the pre-liminary data, one of the statements that portrayed by Ganjar Pranowo on 2.56.43 can identified as negative impoliteness: *“5 tahun yang lalu dalam debat Capres 2019 saya tim kampanye Joko Widodo beliau menyampaikan dan kita diingatkan untuk tidak memilih calon yang punya potongan diktator dan otoriter dan yang punya rekam jejak pelanggaran HAM yang punya rekam jejak untuk melakukan kekerasan yang punya rekam jejak masalah korupsi saya sangat setuju apa yang beliau sampaikan.”*

(Five years ago, during the 2019 presidential debate, I was part of Joko Widodo's campaign team. He reminded us not to choose a candidate with dictatorial and authoritarian tendencies, a record of human rights violations, a history of violence, or issues with corruption. I completely agree with what he said.)

Moreover, previous research has shown that impoliteness in political debates can have a profound impact on the perception of candidates and their overall credibility. In their study on impoliteness in the 2016 U.S. presidential debates, Bastos and Maia (2018) found that instances of impoliteness influenced viewer perceptions of candidates' competence, trustworthiness, and likeability. This suggests that impoliteness can shape public opinion and impact the electoral process. This analysis draws upon the theoretical frameworks of impoliteness scholars like (Culpeper, 2011) who categorize impolite expressions and their potential effects on addressees. By examining the use of impoliteness strategies such as positive impoliteness or negative impoliteness readers can gain valuable insights into the underlying dynamics of the debate and the potential consequences for the public sphere.

This research contributes to the existing literature on political communication by filling a gap in our understanding of impoliteness in presidential debates. By analyzing impoliteness in the context of the final 2024 presidential debate, this study aims to provide valuable insights into the candidates' rhetorical strategies, the impact of impoliteness on political discourse, and its implications for democratic processes. This article highlights the importance of studying impoliteness in political debates, particularly within the context of the final 2024 presidential debate. By drawing on the insights of experts such as Culpeper and the findings of previous research by Bastos and Maia, this article aims to contribute to our understanding of impoliteness as a rhetorical device employed by politicians and its consequences for the democratic process. Through a discourse analysis, this study seeks to shed light on the complex dynamics of impoliteness in political communication and its impact on public opinion.

Impoliteness involves negative attitudes towards certain behaviors in specific contexts. It includes the intentional use of language to belittle or insult someone, often with an understanding of the



harmful intent being communicated. Impoliteness in political discourse has been a subject of considerable scholarly interest, particularly due to its potential impact on social harmony and political stability. The exploration of impoliteness strategies in political settings can offer profound insights into how language shapes public perception and influences voter behavior. Understanding these strategies is essential for comprehending the dynamics of political discourse and its impact on the electorate.

Positive impoliteness strategies, as outlined by Culpeper (1996), include ignoring or snubbing others, excluding them from activities, disassociating from them, and displaying disinterest or lack of sympathy. Other strategies involve using inappropriate identity markers, employing obscure or secretive language, seeking disagreement, making others feel uncomfortable, using taboo words, and calling others derogatory names. Negative impoliteness strategies involve instilling fear, condescending, scorning or ridiculing others, invading their personal space, explicitly associating them with negative aspects, and putting their indebtedness on record.

Prior research has demonstrated the significant role that impolite language plays in political campaigns and debates, often leading to heightened tensions and conflict. Neshkovska (2020) examined the linguistic strategies used by political contenders to generate impoliteness in a public debate. The results showed that impoliteness was present in almost all the question-answer blocks, with only one block containing no impoliteness. The study also notes that the contenders' use of impoliteness strategies was influenced by the gender roles and social attitudes towards masculinity and femininity. Another research related to this topic was done by Alemi & Latifi (2019). The study discussed about the realization of impoliteness in arguments between Democrats and Republicans over the US government shutdown issue in 2013. The study found that both parties employed similar impoliteness strategies in their arguments, including disassociate from the other, use inappropriate identity markers, seek disagreement/avoid agreement, threaten/frighten, condescend, scorn or ridicule, explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect, sarcasm/mock impoliteness, and challenges.

Meanwhile, Arrasyd&Hamzah (2019) examined the impoliteness strategies used by netizens in YouTube comments during the 2019 Indonesian presidential debate between Jokowi-Maaruf and Prabowo-Sandi, focusing on gender differences in these strategies. The study found that from the 200 comments collected, there were 267 impoliteness strategies identified. The most frequently used impoliteness strategy was positive impoliteness, which accounted for 42% of the strategies used by female netizens to Jokowi-Maaruf and 40% by male netizens to Jokowi-Maaruf. Moreover, another research has been conducted by Pandov (2021). The study discussed impoliteness in American presidential debates from 2000 to 2020. The findings is impoliteness plays a significant role in these debates, and its usage can be influenced by contextual variability and the candidates' overall rhetorical styles.



Ibrahim, O. A. (2022) had a clear examination of the impoliteness strategies employed by President Donald Trump during the 2020 American Presidential Debates. The study discussed impoliteness in American presidential debates from 2000 to 2020. The researcher conducts an analysis of the impoliteness types present in Trump's discourse, utilizing existing data and textual excerpts, which are categorized into bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock impoliteness, and withhold politeness. Specifically, the researcher applies Culpeper's model of impoliteness strategies, sub-strategies, and functions—namely 'affective', 'coercive', and 'entertaining'—to five selected texts from Trump's second debate with Joe Biden in 2020.

#### Text (1)

Trump: "It is not guaranteed but it will be by the end of the year, but I think it has a good chance."  
"

In the first text, Trump utilizes positive impoliteness as a defensive tactic regarding his policy on the coronavirus vaccine, deliberately creating ambiguity to sow doubt. This strategy aims to undermine Biden's claims and induce uncertainty among the audience, thus affecting their perception of Biden's credibility. Trump's use of 'seeking disagreement' as a sub-strategy falls under the affective function of impoliteness, conveying his emotions and disagreement strongly.

#### Text (2)

Welker: "let me talk about"

Trump: "Excuse me."

Moving to the second text, Trump employs a bald on record impoliteness strategy by interrupting the moderator when she attempts to redirect the discussion to Biden. His abrupt interruption demonstrates disregard for Biden's viewpoint, falling under the 'interrupting and pausing' sub-strategy. Trump's use of "Excuse me" serves as a direct expression of his disregard, showcasing his affective function in displaying his emotions openly.

#### Text (3)

Trump: "No, I think my timeline is going to be more accurate."

In the third text, Trump's use of "No" constitutes positive impoliteness, rejecting the interlocutor's opinion and refusing to acknowledge Biden's perspective. By employing 'seek disagreement' as a sub-strategy, Trump defends against Biden's attacks and accusations, conveying his feelings strongly and negatively impacting Biden's reputation. This speech demonstrates Trump's affective function in conveying his emotions and ideas strongly to the audience.

#### Text (4)

Biden: "I did not say either of those things."

Trump: "you certainly did."

Text four illustrates Trump's utilization of negative impoliteness, employing rudeness, scorn, and ridicule against Biden to undermine his reputation. By accusing Biden directly and associating him



with negative aspects, Trump aims to discredit Biden in the eyes of the audience, showcasing the coercive function of his speech in eliciting uncontrollable emotions towards Biden.

#### Text (5)

Trump: "I take full responsibility. It is not my fault that it comes here. It is China's fault. You know what, it is not Joe's fault that it come here either. It is China's fault."

Lastly, in text five, Trump explicitly associates Biden with the negative aspects of the coronavirus pandemic, blaming China for its spread. By linking Biden with fault, Trump employs negative impoliteness to attack Biden, thus affecting the audience's perception of Biden negatively and showcasing the affective function of his speech in connecting negative emotions with China's actions.

These strategies by Culpeper (1996) emphasize power dynamics and aim to belittle or undermine opponents. By analyzing these impoliteness strategies in the final 2024 Indonesian presidential debate, the study reveals how candidates use language to assert their views and critique their opponents, highlighting the contentious nature of political debates.

## METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative approach, specifically focusing on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), to investigate the nuances of language use in social contexts (Wodak and Mayer, 2009). CDA, as articulated by Van Dijk (2006), is driven by the aim to comprehend critical social issues and explores how discourse both shapes and is shaped by power dynamics within society. The research draws its data from the final 2024 Indonesian presidential debate, featuring prominent candidates: Prabowo Subianto, Anies Baswedan, and Ganjar Pranowo. This debate was selected for its significance in the electoral process and its potential to reveal various impoliteness strategies. Data collection involved transcribing the debate from the social media platform YouTube Channel named KPU RI, ensuring accuracy through cross-referencing and triangulation (Ifkarina & Rojabi, 2023). The analysis adopts Culpeper's (1996, 2011) impoliteness model, categorizing strategies such as positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, bald on record impoliteness, and sarcasm. A representative sample of 35 instances of impoliteness was selected for the analysis, with each instance classified by the candidate using the strategy and the specific type of impoliteness employed. This methodology enables a thorough examination of how each candidate employs impoliteness to shape public perception and influence political dynamics.





## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### I. Prabowo Speech Analysis

#### a. Bald on Record Impoliteness

##### Text (1):

**Prabowo:** *"Jadi kalau internet gratis ya Saya setuju tapi jangan internet gratis lebih dipentingkan daripada makan gratis makan ini mutlak untuk rakyat kita mereka harus makan anak-anak harus makan orang miskin harus makan itu maksud saya kalau internet gratis bagus untuk ketimpangan digital dan sebagainya."*

Prabowo directly states that providing free internet should not be prioritized over providing free meals. This direct statement doesn't soften his stance, showing bald on record impoliteness as he dismisses the idea without hesitation.

#### b. Positive Impoliteness

##### Text (2):

**Prabowo:** *"Kalau saya selalu solutif dan tindakan kalau memang hanya setengah triliun perlu kehendak politik ya bangun itu pabrik segera."*

Here, Prabowo implies that others may not be as action-oriented or proactive as he is. By highlighting his own decisiveness, he indirectly criticizes others, suggesting they lack political will. This hurts the positive face of others, making it Positive Impoliteness.

#### c. Negative Impoliteness

##### Text (3):

**Prabowo:** *"Jadi saya eh agak berbeda saya tidak ikut paham-paham newolip bahwa pemerintah bukan hanya regulator pemerintah di depan pelopor intervensi."*

Prabowo criticizes those who follow "newolip" (new liberal policies), implying that these policies are ineffective. This attacks the negative face of those who support such policies, making them feel inferior. This is an example of Negative Impoliteness.

#### d. Mock or Sarcasm Impoliteness

##### Text (4):

**Prabowo:** *"Pak Ganjar kita mengetahui masalah yang sangat penting dihadapi bangsa kita adalah bahwa banyak sekali anak-anak kita yang kurang gizi stunting. Saya ingin bertanya apakah Bapak setuju dengan eh gagasan saya untuk memberi makan bergizi untuk seluruh anak-anak Indonesia untuk mengatasi masalah stunting dan menghilangkan ee kemiskinan ekstrem dan juga mengurangi ee angka kematian ibu-ibu pada saat melahirkan Terima kasih."*



Prabowo's question to Ganjar can be seen as sarcastic. He implies that his ideas are new or better, even though these solutions are well-known. This subtly belittles Ganjar's stance or suggestions, making it Mock or Sarcasm Impoliteness.

**Table 1 : Results of Impoliteness strategies in Prabowo's Speech**

<b>Strategies of Impoliteness</b>		
Strategies of Impoliteness	Frequency	Percentage
Bald on Record Impoliteness	7	35%
Positive Impoliteness	6	30%
Negative Impoliteness	4	20%
Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness	3	15%
Withhold Impoliteness	0	0%
Total	20	100%

From the analysis of Prabowo Subianto's speech, one can observe that the positive impoliteness strategy has the highest number of occurrences, appearing (7) times and constituting about (35%) of the total number of impoliteness strategies. This is because Prabowo often uses positive impoliteness to challenge and indirectly criticize his opponents' ideas and policies. Negative impoliteness occurs (6) times, making up (30%) of the total occurrences. Prabowo uses this strategy to directly criticize and undermine his opponents, questioning their competence and decisions. Mock or sarcasm impoliteness is found (4) times, which is (20%) of the total. Prabowo employs sarcasm to subtly mock his opponents, adding an element of irony to his statements, which serves to belittle their positions indirectly. Bald on record impoliteness appears (3) times, accounting for (15%) of the total. Prabowo uses direct statements to express his opinions without softening his stance, which can come across as blunt or harsh. Finally, withhold impoliteness has (0) occurrences, at a percentage of (0%). Prabowo does not use this strategy, as he tends to express his viewpoints clearly and openly rather than avoiding criticism. The total number of impoliteness strategies found in Prabowo's speech is (20), making up a percentage of (100%). This distribution highlights Prabowo's preference for positive and negative impoliteness strategies to assert his views and challenge his opponents during the debate.

## 2. Ganjar Speech Analysis

### a. Bald on Record Impoliteness

#### Text (1):

**Ganjar:** *"Kalau ngasih makannya kepada anak-anak untuk mencegah stunting saya sama sekali tidak setuju karena Bapak terlambat pak stunting itu ditangani sejak bayi dalam kandungan Pak ibunya yang dikasih gizi."*





Ganjar bluntly rejects Prabowo's idea of providing nutritious food to children to prevent stunting, stating directly that he does not agree and calling the approach "terlambat" (too late). This straightforward rejection without any attempt to soften the disagreement is an example of Bald on Record Impoliteness.

#### **b. Positive Impoliteness**

##### **Text (2):**

**Ganjar:** *"Saya mau bercerita pengalaman saya ketika guru SMA SMK SLB pada provinsi maka pada saat itu yang saya tanya pertama adalah Berapa gajimu 3.300.000 Pak, sungguh tidak adil pemerintah ini maka pada saat itu saya sampaikan kasih gaji sesuai UMP yang ada di Jawa Tengah UMK yang ada di Jawa Tengah tambah 10%."*

By stating "sungguh tidak adil pemerintah ini" (this government is truly unfair), Ganjar attacks the positive face of those in charge, implying they are unjust and not fulfilling their duties. This makes people feel bad about their actions or policies, thus using Positive Impoliteness.

#### **c. Negative Impoliteness**

##### **Text (3):**

**Ganjar:** *"Kalau pendidikan mau maju maka fasilitas mesti diberikan negara harus hadir dan makin inklusi."*

Ganjar implies that the current educational facilities and government involvement are insufficient, attacking the negative face of the responsible parties by suggesting they have not done enough. This makes them feel pressured or inferior, an example of Negative Impoliteness.

#### **d. Mock or Sarcasm Impoliteness**

##### **Text (4):**

**Ganjar:** *"Pak Anis lagi ramai kita mau tanya soal Bansos karena menurut saya Bansos ini adalah kewajiban negara dan rakyat berhak mendapatkannya tapi kita punya problem karena banyak klaim yang diberikan seolah-olah ini bantuan orang perorangan atau kelompok."*

Ganjar sarcastically highlights the issue of social assistance (Bansos) being claimed as personal or group contributions rather than state obligations. His phrasing "seolah-olah ini bantuan orang perorangan atau kelompok" mocks the way the assistance is portrayed, making it Mock or Sarcasm Impoliteness.



**Table 2 : Results of Impoliteness strategies in Ganjar's Speech**

<b>Strategies of Impoliteness</b>		
Strategies of Impoliteness	Frequency	Percentage
Bald on Record Impoliteness	2	18.2%
Positive Impoliteness	3	27.3%
Negative Impoliteness	4	36.4%
Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness	2	18.2%
Withhold Impoliteness	0	0%
Total	11	100%

From the table above, one can observe that the negative impoliteness strategy has the highest number of occurrences, appearing 4 times and constituting about 36.4% of the total number of impoliteness strategies. This is because Ganjar Pranowo frequently uses negative impoliteness to challenge his opponents' competence and decisions, often criticizing their policies and questioning their abilities directly. Positive impoliteness occurs 3 times, making up 27.3% of the total. Ganjar uses this strategy to indirectly criticize his opponents and highlight their shortcomings by undermining their positive face, such as by questioning their credibility or intentions. Sarcasm or mock impoliteness is found 2 times, which is 18.2% of the total. Ganjar employs sarcasm to subtly mock his opponents, adding an element of irony to his statements, which serves to belittle their positions indirectly. Bald on record impoliteness also appears 2 times, accounting for 18.2% of the total. Ganjar uses direct statements to express his opinions bluntly, without softening his stance, which can come across as harsh or straightforward. Finally, withhold impoliteness has 0 occurrences, at a percentage of 0%. Ganjar does not use this strategy, as he tends to express his viewpoints clearly and openly rather than avoiding criticism. The total number of impoliteness strategies found in Ganjar's speech is 11, making up a percentage of 100%. This distribution highlights Ganjar's preference for negative and positive impoliteness strategies to assert his views and challenge his opponents during the debate.

### 3. Anies Speech Analysis

#### a. Bald on Record Impoliteness

##### Text (1)

**Anies:** *"Kesehatan mental kekerasan seksual lebih 15 juta orang jadi korban ini problem-problem yang tidak menjadi kepedulian segelintir elit ini adalah kepedulian rakyat Kebanyakan karena itu dalam perjalanan kami 1 tahun kami menemukan jutaan rakyat yang berbondong-bondong menginginkan perubahan"*

This segment directly addresses serious issues (mental health and sexual violence) affecting millions, criticizing a small elite for their lack of concern. This is a clear, unambiguous criticism directed at a specific group, making it an example of bald on record impoliteness.



## **b. Positive Impoliteness**

### **Text (2)**

**Anies:** *"Terima kasih Pak Ganjar pertama kita harus menyadari bahwa yang, disebut sebagai Bansos adalah bantuan untuk si penerima bukan bantuan untuk si pemberi karenanya dia diberikan sesuai dengan kebutuhan si penerima kalau penerimanya membutuhkan bulan ini ya diberi bulan ini kalau dibutuhkannya 3 bulan lagi ya 3 bulan lagi tidak usah dirapel semuanya"*

Anies is addressing Ganjar and correcting a potential misconception about Bansos (social assistance), emphasizing that it should meet the recipient's needs rather than the giver's convenience. This implies that Ganjar might not understand this fundamental principle, thereby damaging his positive face.

### **Text (3)**

**Anies:** *"Baik terima kasih Jadi tapi ini juga Pak Prabowo yang saya hormati kita banyak memberikan perhatian pada aspek kuratifnya itu memang betul harus dikerjakan tapi jangan lupa aspek preventifnya dan ketika bicara aspek kuratif ada dua satu adalah soft infrastructure tadi tenaga medisnya yang kedua hard infrastructure-nya"*

Anies starts with a polite acknowledgment but then points out what Prabowo has missed (preventive aspects). This damages Prabowo's positive face by suggesting he overlooked a critical aspect of the issue.

## **c. Negative Impoliteness**

### **Text (4)**

**Anies:** *"Terima kasih Pak Prabowo Mohon maaf nampaknya Bapak belum menjawab pertanyaan kami karena pertanyaan adalah tentang perlindungan perempuan yang permasalahan apa dan bagaimana mengubahnya mohon nanti sesudah ini mungkin bisa dielaborasi soal perlindungannya."*

Anies indirectly criticizes Prabowo by suggesting he has not answered the question adequately. This implies Prabowo's response was inadequate, thereby undermining his competence.

**Table 3: Results of Impoliteness Strategies in Anies' Speech**

<b>Strategies of Impoliteness</b>		
Strategies of Impoliteness	Frequency	Percentage
Bald on Record Impoliteness	1	25%
Positive Impoliteness	2	50%



Negative Impoliteness	1	25%
Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness	0	0%
Withhold Impoliteness	0	0%
Total	4	100%

From the analysis of Anies Baswedan's speech, one can observe that positive impoliteness strategy has the highest number of occurrences, appearing 2 times and constituting about 50% of the total number of impoliteness strategies in Anies speech. This is because Anies often uses positive impoliteness to challenge and indirectly criticize his opponents' ideas and policies. Bald on record impoliteness and negative impoliteness each occur once, making up 25% of the total occurrences. Anies uses these strategies to directly address issues and criticize his opponents, questioning their competence and decisions. There are no occurrences of sarcasm or mock impoliteness, and withhold impoliteness, as Anies tends to express his viewpoints clearly and openly rather than avoiding criticism. The total number of impoliteness strategies found in Anies' speech is 4, making up a percentage of 100%. This distribution highlights Anies' preference for positive impoliteness strategies to assert his views and challenge his opponents during the debate.

## CONCLUSION

The analysis of the final 2024 Presidential Debate reveals that the candidates predominantly use positive and negative impoliteness strategies. These strategies are employed to assert their viewpoints, challenge their opponents, and underscore their rhetorical styles during the debate. Prabowo Subianto frequently utilizes positive impoliteness, accounting for 35% of his impoliteness strategies, to challenge and indirectly criticize his opponents' ideas and policies. Negative impoliteness, constituting 30% of his strategies, is also significant in Prabowo's speech, as he directly undermines his opponents' competence and decisions. Together, these strategies form a substantial portion of Prabowo's rhetorical approach. Ganjar Pranowo shows a preference for negative impoliteness, which makes up 36.4% of his total impoliteness usage. This indicates his tendency to directly criticize his opponents' abilities and decisions. Positive impoliteness, used 27.3% of the time, allows Ganjar to indirectly criticize his opponents and highlight their shortcomings. Anies Baswedan, while employing fewer instances of impoliteness overall, also favors positive impoliteness, with 50% of his impoliteness strategies falling into this category. This strategy helps him indirectly challenge and criticize his opponents' policies.

Across all candidates, bald on record impoliteness and sarcasm or mock impoliteness are used less frequently, and withhold impoliteness is notably absent from their strategies. This absence suggests a preference for direct and open expression of criticism rather than avoidance. In summary, the debate is characterized by a predominant use of positive and negative impoliteness strategies, with candidates leveraging these approaches to assert their views and critique their opponents. These



findings highlight the competitive and confrontational nature of the discourse in the 2024 Presidential Debate.

## REFERENCES

- Alemi, M., & Latifi, A. (2019). The realization of impoliteness in arguments between the Democrats and Republicans over the government shutdown issue in the US. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 23(1), 83–97.
- Arrasyd, & Hamzah. (2019). Impoliteness strategies in YouTube comment section found in Indonesian presidential debate 2019. *E-Journal of English Language and Literature*, 8(4).
- Bustan, E. S., & Alakrash, H. M. (2020). An analysis of impoliteness strategies performed by Donald Trump tweets addressing the Middle East countries. *Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia*.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349-367.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence. *Cambridge University Press*.
- Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(2), 359-383.
- Ibrahim, O. A. (2022). *The Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 61(3), 1.
- Ifechelobi, J. N., & Alakrash, H. M. (2020). Positive impoliteness strategy in political discourse: A textual analysis of 2011-2015 presidential election campaign speeches in selected Nigerian newspapers. *Interdisciplinary Journal of African and Asian Studies*, 6(2), 150.
- Ifkarina, N. M., & Rojabi, A. R. (2023). EFL learners' experiences of using e-learning in an English course. *Journal of English Teaching Adi Buana*, 8(2), 167.
- Mogasha, T. (2014). Understanding critical discourse analysis in qualitative research. . *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education* , 1(7), 104-113.
- Neshkovska, S. (2020). Impoliteness on the political stage: The case of the 2019 final Macedonian presidential debate. *Impoliteness on the political stage: The case of the 2019 final Macedonian presidential debate* Lodz Papers in Pragmatics, 16(2), 285–304.
- Pandov, K. (2021). A comparative analysis of impoliteness in American presidential debates 2000-2020 . *Bachelor's thesis, Department of English, English Linguistics*.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory, and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 1-33). *Sage Publications*.