

1. 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 language of politics as an occupation is important 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 has the risks to the opinion of the public. 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 audiences through the language they speak. The choice of the 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 in which it is regarded as a democratic country, political debates in a presidential election campaign have always become trending topics in many 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 schedules of debates and it is separated between president candidates and vice president candidates with the 2 of the schedules made only for vice presidents debate. Debates between politicians become one of 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 for the Indonesian Presidential Election Debate 2024. The reason why the researcher is interested in examining the phenomenon about the Vice President Debate is that they became controversial in social media and actual television news right after the debate was held. In a situation in which the debate became dramatic after it was held due to netizens sharing the cutted videos and making controversial comments. The cutted videos made provocations to hate one and another

candidates. In the video on the debate stage, they attacked each other with vulgar statements. In this case, they use impoliteness to attack other candidates but one of them was apparently loose and cannot handle other candidates again. He used a sad expression so that netizens feel sorry for him and promise to vote for him. Due to research about Donald Trump's debate, he used impolite strategies to win the politics but Indonesia is the opposite. The one who used impoliteness strategies seems to be hated by citizens and netizens mostly feel sympathetic to the loser in the debate stage. It makes the researcher wants to deeply research about impoliteness strategies that were used in the debate which influenced the atmosphere on the debate stage.

Impoliteness is associated with using language in inappropriate context which can sound negatively listened to by other people. Locher and Watts (2008) argue that impoliteness behavior is negatively marked behavior. It means that society has their own social norms that are agreed 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 it does not exactly happen. The addressee does not feel anything and just keeps quiet even though he has been attacked. Locher (2008) stated 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 regarding the structure of society, particularly with regard to the ways in which 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 cause offense 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 behaviour that is face-aggravating in a particular context, (2) [rude behaviour] does not utilise 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 conventionalised 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 conventionalised 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, 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; they are 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 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) said 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 conducted by Sri and Busmin (2017). They discovered three out of five impoliteness strategies by Culpeper's theory; there are bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. The most frequently impoliteness strategies used were positive impoliteness. In addition, another study conducted by Lucky B. (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 strategy to occur in this research. (2) The characters in Sherlock frequently employed impoliteness strategy with 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, another study conducted by Monir et al (2017), the most frequent impoliteness strategy is positive impoliteness strategy which is damaging interlocutors' positive face. A study by Mariam and Nawal (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 result of another research by Rudi Anshari et al (2022) shows three functions of impoliteness strategies found and the most dominant function used by the customers is affective impoliteness which earns 62%. Affective impoliteness is the emotional explosion such as anger/indignation that is caused by an impolite utterance. Another researcher found the result of functions of impoliteness, the dominant use is affective impoliteness according to the rude behavior in the Australian restaurant "Karen's Dinner."

Many studies indeed have examined the impoliteness strategies, but they only focused on types and functions of impoliteness strategies, leaving the responses toward the impoliteness acts unaddressed. Hence, considering the importance of examining the impoliteness strategies, this research examines impoliteness strategies used by three candidates, they are Muhaimin Iskandar, Gibran Rakabuming, and Mahfud MD. This research analyzes the debate video of the 2nd Debate of Vice President candidates from YouTube. There are 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).