

**A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES IN THE
SECOND DEBATE OF INDONESIAN VICE PRESIDENT CANDIDATES 2024**

A Research Paper

Submitted as Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for *Sarjana Sastra Degree*
of the English Language and Literature Study Program



Mentari Ramadanti Kusumah

2001115

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE STUDY PROGRAM
FACULTY OF LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA
2024**

**A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES IN THE
SECOND DEBATE OF INDONESIAN VICE PRESIDENT CANDIDATES 2024**

Oleh

Mentari Ramadanti Kusumah

Sebuah skripsi yang diajukan untuk memenuhi salah satu syarat memperoleh gelar
Sarjana Sastra pada Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni

© Mentari Ramadanti Kusumah 2024

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

Agustus 2024

Hak Cipta dilindungi undang-undang.


Skripsi ini tidak boleh diperbanyak seluruhnya atau sebagian,
dengan dicetak ulang, difoto kopi, atau cara lainnya tanpa ijin dari penulis.

PAGE OF APPROVAL


**A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES IN THE
SECOND DEBATE OF INDONESIAN VICE PRESIDENT CANDIDATES 2024**

**A Research Paper by
Mentari Ramadanti Kusumah
2001115**

**Approved by:
Supervisor**


Ernie D. Ayu Imperiani, M.Ed.
NIP. 197809222010122001

**Head of English Language and Literature Program
Faculty of Language and Literature Education
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia**


Prof. Eri Kurniawan, S.Pd., M.A., Ph.D.
NIP. 198111232005011002

A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES IN THE SECOND DEBATE OF INDONESIAN VICE PRESIDENT CANDIDATES 2024

Mentari Ramadanti Kusumah

*English Language and Literature, Faculty of Language and Literature Education,
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia*

**Corresponding author email: mentarirk@upi.edu*

ABSTRACT

This research is a pragmatic study which investigates impolite acts performed in Vice Presidents' Debate by three candidates: Muhaimin Iskandar, Gibran Rakabuming, and Mahfud MD. It aims to describe the types and functions of impoliteness strategies and to identify the candidates' responses toward the impoliteness strategies performed in the debate. This research employed a descriptive qualitative method in which the data were in the form of utterances. The data source was taken from the debate video of the 2nd Debate of Vice President candidates from YouTube. Drawing on Culpeper's (2011) theory on impoliteness strategies, the results of this research reveal that all five types of impoliteness strategies are used by the three candidates with **Bald on Record Impoliteness** as the most dominant type used in the debate with 12 occurrences (30%). This finding indicates that the candidates mostly attack their candidates in a direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way. Moreover, **Positive Impoliteness**, **Negative Impoliteness**, **Sarcasm and Mock Impoliteness** have the same numbers with 9 occurrences (22.5%), and **Withhold Politeness** is only used 1 (2.5%). Regarding functions, three functions of impoliteness strategies are discovered; namely **Affective Impoliteness** with 21 occurrences (52.5%), **Coercive Impoliteness** with 16 occurrences (40%), and **Entertaining Impoliteness** with 3 occurrences (7.5%). The most dominant function used by the candidates is **Affective Impoliteness**. This suggests that the candidates aim to make emotional explosions to 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 citizens whether to vote for politicians or hate the politicians due to their performance on the debate stage.

Keywords: *Debate, Functions of Impoliteness Strategies, Impoliteness Strategies, Responses, Types of Impoliteness Strategies*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE OF APPROVAL	i
ABSTRACT	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	2
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	5
3.1 Research Design	5
3.2 Procedures of Data Collection	5
3.3 Procedures Data analysis	6
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	7
4.1 Types of the Impoliteness Strategies	8
4.1.1 Bald on Record Impoliteness	8
4.1.2 Negative Impoliteness	10
4.1.3 Positive Impoliteness	11
4.1.4 Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness	12
4.1.5 Withhold Politeness	13
4.2 Functions of the Impoliteness Strategies	14
4.2.1 Affective Impoliteness	14
4.2.2 Coercive Impoliteness	15
4.2.3 Entertaining Impoliteness	16
4.3 Candidates' Responses toward the Impoliteness Acts	18
4.3.1 Accepting the Face Attack	18
4.3.2 Countering the Face Attack	19
4.3.3 Choosing Not to Respond	20
CONCLUSION	21
REFERENCES	22

REFERENCES

- Beard, A. *The Language of Politics*. (2000). 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: James E. Alatis, Carolyn A. Strachle, Brent Gallenberger and Maggie Ronkin (eds.) *Linguistics and the Education of Language Teachers: Ethnolinguistic, Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistic Aspects*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, pp. 154-68.
- Bousfield, D. (2008) *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bousfield, D. and Locher, M. A. (eds.) (2008) *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). *Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness*. Journal of Pragmatics, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 286-292.
- Culpeper, J. (2005). *Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: The Weakest Link*. Journal of Politeness Research., Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 78-88.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J., Bousefield, D., & Wichmann. A. 2003. *Impoliteness Revisited: With Special Reference to Dynamic and Prosodic Aspect*. Journal of Pragmatics 35: 1545-1579.
- Culpeper, J., Haugh, M., & Kádár, D. Z. (2017). The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness. In *Palgrave Macmillan UK eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-37508-7>
- Lucky B., J. (2015). *A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES IN BRITISH TV-SERIES SHERLOCK*.
<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/33528571.pdf>

- 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): 101-29. Language Research. <https://www.jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/view/579>
- Impoliteness*. (n.d.). Pragmatics & Discourse at IU. <https://pragmatics.indiana.edu/politeness/impoliteness.html>
- Mirhosseini, M., Mardanshahi, M., & Dowlatabadi, H. (2017, May 3). *Impoliteness Strategies Based on Culpeper's Model: An Analysis of Gender Differences between Two Characters in the movie Mother*. Mirhosseini | Journal of Applied Linguistics and Impoliteness: using and understanding the language of offence. (n.d.). <http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/impoliteness/index.htm>
- 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). <https://doi.org/10.24114/lt.v16i1.15727>
- Sidiropoulou, M. (2021). *Translation, Im/Politeness and Fiction*. In: *Understanding Im/politeness Through Translation. Advances in (Im)politeness Studies*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63530-5_4
- Terkourafi, M. (2008) *Towards a unified theory of politeness, impoliteness, and rudeness*. In: Derek Bousfield and Miriam Locher (eds.) *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 45-74.