

Politeness Strategy Found in the Third Debate of Presidential Candidates for the 2024 Election

Meli Fauziah¹, Eko Widiyanto², Renggi Vrika³, Luis Miguel Cardoso⁴, Alesa Durgaryan⁵

¹ Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Curup, Bengkulu, Indonesia

² University of Galway, City of Galway, Ireland

³ UIN Imam Bonjol, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

⁴ Polytechnic Institute of Portalegre, Portugal

⁵ Armenian State Pedagogical University, Armenia

Corresponding Email: melifauziah@iaincurup.ac.id

To cite this article:

Fauziah, M., Widiyanto, E., & Vrika, R. Politeness Strategy Found in the Third Debate of Presidential Candidates for the 2024 Election. ENGLISH FRANCA : Academic Journal of English Language and Education. Retrieved from <https://journal.iaincurup.ac.id/index.php/english/article/view/11209>

Abstract. This study aims to investigate politeness in presidential candidate debates from the Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS) perspective. The approach was taken because there was a lack of studies that connected politeness with IS, considering that IS is great for examining social phenomena, especially sensitive conversations between high-status people. To acquire a clear insight into the phenomenon, this study uses discourse analysis on video transcripts of “The Third Debate of Presidential Candidates for the 2024 Election,” taken from the KPU RI YouTube channel. The analysis process drew on existing research to support the interpretation. The researcher analyses 170 data (clustered into 117 data of positive face and 53 data of negative face), including the frequencies and categories from the face-saving acts (FSA) and face-threatening acts (FTA). The identified aspects of Face-threatening Acts (FTAs) are criticism, threat, interruption, critical disagreement, dismissal or ignorance, and demanding a satisfying response. Face-saving Acts (FSAs) identified aspects are providing equal opportunity, clarifying and apologizing, requesting cooperation, agreement while giving criticism, and providing equal opportunity. Fascinatingly, this study found that face-threatening acts sometimes necessary to use and impolite acts are acceptable if the speaker had “roles” in the conversation. Additionally, this study discovered that it is possible to measure the significance level of politeness, which will be extremely helpful for future research.

Keywords: *Politeness, Face (Positive Face & Negative Face), Face-Threatening Act (FTA), Face-Saving Act (FSA)*

Introduction

In their book, (Johnson et al., 1988) emphasize that pragmatics is about human behavior and interaction, and meaning. This has a lot to do with the idea of being polite in communication. It is argued that politeness is a universal quality since it is a deeply rooted value and a means of preserving the intended public image of the parties involved in interactions. Therefore, the act used to show awareness of others’ feeling during interactions could be categorized as politeness strategy which usually divided as positive politeness or negative politeness. In such cases, it is important to consider one’s faces and aware of utterances that could result in unnecessary impolite cases especially in high-pressure situations as debate or negotiating either in real life conversation or TV Shows.

Article info:

<http://journal.iaincurup.ac.id/index.php/english>

Received 24 April 2024; Received in revised form 10 July 2024; Accepted 24 August 2024, Available Online 24 November 2024

Published by Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Curup on behalf of ENGLISH FRANCA: Academic Journal of English Language and Education. This is an open-access article under the CC BY-SA license Copyright (c) 2024 Author

The term "politeness" describes the social norms, customs, or traditions that exist in a culture. From a critical sociolinguistic standpoint, social status and power are intrinsically linked to the discourse of politeness. For example, those with strong social standing tend to be more courteous. There are undoubtedly social hierarchy consequences to this condition. A high social standing is a sign of status, but a prominent person's hegemony over their subordinates is a sign of power. Prior studies have demonstrated a strong correlation between power and an older, intelligent, and well-educated population. These indications, however, have changed to wealth, position, and fame in the current digital era (Suparno et al., 2023). As a result, the dynamics of power and status in polite society were redefined to include politeness in power and status as a benchmark for respectful and dignified communication behavior, as well as respect for others' rights, ethics, and obligations, all of which are connected to an individual's position or positions held in the digital sphere.

Various problems and interactions arise when one chooses to be impolite or courteous, depending on the perspective taken. The hierarchical and conflictual structure of society involves the expected characteristics of ideology, power, face, and identity. In addition to being components of a controlled and homogeneous social structure, conventionalism, conventions, rituals, and morals also serve as instruments for the hierarchical structure of society (Baider et al., 2020). In summary, politeness strategies are done by people involved in determining if the tactics used in communication contexts are appropriate. Expectations are set in connection with the "common ground" that language speakers negotiate as well as deeply ingrained moral values, viewed from a wide and context-sensitive standpoint. This point of view inevitably leads to corpus-based or experimental cross-cultural and intercultural research.

This is accurate, particularly in Indonesia. For instance, people talked with politeness when individuals of various ages spoke to one another. Particularly in delicate situations such as political encounters, politeness or impoliteness typically arise in TV programs like presidential candidate debates, which typically feature heated, emotional conversations in which polite or impoliteness frequently occur. Based on these occurrences, the phenomena of these presidential candidate debates might be researched by concentrating on how politeness affects communication as the intricacy of this phenomenon is fascinating since it leads to a variety of politeness strategies while still allowing communication to flow unhindered. If we limit our attention only to the politeness method employed in interpersonal contact, the intricacy of the situation becomes excessive so that this phenomenon worth studying in subtle way. This opinion assumed as there were lot of research of politeness, especially politeness strategy such as face-saving acts and face-threatening acts. However, there were none of them that study the politeness by considering links of cultural variety and social to the meaning of the language that each speaker utter while interacting. As a result, we require an approach for this detailed conversation analysis, such as interactional sociolinguistics.

Interactional Sociolinguistics is a theory and methodology that primarily drew from the writings of John Joseph Gumperz. It aims to understand how persons convey and interpret meaning in social interactions by analyzing and integrating linguistic, anthropological, and sociological viewpoints to create a single qualitative interpretive approach and establish the analytical processes for sociolinguistic analysis. The purpose here is to identify the links between language, cultural variety, and society. Furthermore, this approach can be used for any type of contact, including cross- and intracultural interactions (Toomaneejinda & Saengboon, 2022). Interactional Sociolinguistic theory was used in many different sociolinguistic studies. For example, to look at the interaction of EFL classroom (Agustine et al., 2021), challenges in interactions or as complex as looking at the interactions and ideologies that come from it in northwest Amazon (Stenzel & Williams, 2021) even redesigning the prompt to make the better AI-Chatbot (Dippold et al., 2020). Given that sociolinguistics has historically focused on connections and interactions at work (Canagarajah, 2020), interactional sociolinguistics was chosen as a base approach to study politeness strategy.

Despite the complexity of the interactional sociolinguistics raised above, considering the interaction between social communities mainly focused on how to behave or communicate with different ages and circumstances, especially in politeness, this interactional sociolinguistics could be studied and blended with politeness. For example, positive politeness easily occurred in real life conversation with people that have significant differences in age (Masruddin et al., 2023). Although negative politeness rarely occurs in real-life conversation, negative politeness used by people has been identified on hidden camera shows (Suyono & Andriyanti, 2021) and online consumer reviews which indicated that the politeness and non-politeness communication strategies are found mainly in on-record consumer reviews (Feng & Ren, 2020). In this way, being polite or impolite could occur in socially distant or close situations.

Therefore, it's intriguing to think about the possibility that politeness has happened in political debates held by governments. It is anticipated that if we investigate these interactions in depth, we may find some intriguing sociolinguistic research. The primary goal of this study is to clarify instances of politeness and impoliteness that occurred in these circumstances.

Theoretical Framework

Politeness Strategy

Since the early 2000s, scholars have predominantly examined the evaluation of politeness and impoliteness rather than their production, often within longer interactions. Research has concentrated on synchronous interpersonal interactions and their associated reactions, with some attempts to link evaluations with speaker intentions. However, limited attention has been paid to the variation in offense evaluations in local contexts or factors beyond dyadic interactions. Politeness research has largely favored modern data over historical contexts, despite some researchers highlighting the importance of historical politeness. Additionally, research has primarily focused on the language use of middle-class individuals in friction-free settings. While rudeness and aggression have gained attention since the early 2000s, there has been little exploration into more "rough" realms of language use, such as ritual cursing or impoliteness practices in economic migratory contexts involving low-skilled migrants and their exploitation (Kádár et al., 2021). Politeness could easily be identified in the conversation of a community that has social class (Banda, 2020) or a community that occurred with people from different ages (Suparno et al., 2023). This also emerges as a popular study with the term politeness strategy in recent years.

It is explained in (Aporbo et al., 2024) that the use of in-group identifiers, avoiding conflict, presuming/raising/asserting common ground, joking, and including both the speaker and the hearer in the activity are examples of positive politeness strategies. The hearer's interest, wishes, and needs are also taken into consideration. Also, the negative politeness technique recognizes that the individuals we engage with desire to be respected, just like positive politeness does.

There are several different forms of politeness that occur during interactions. A speaker commits a face-threatening act when they say something that undermines others' assumptions about their own self-image. Alternatively, the speaker may say something to reduce the potential threat if they believe that certain behaviors could be seen as a threat to others' faces. This is called face-saving acts (FSA). FSA has been studied in the conversations such as how teachers respond to critical feedback (Bjørndal, 2020), or at the conversation on face-to-face diplomacy interaction (Nair, 2019). Technically, a person's "face" refers to their self-image in public. It alludes to the social and emotional feelings that everyone has and hopes others will recognize as well. The purpose of politeness is to maintain the psychological desire for respect and acceptance, or "face", of the speaker and listener. People usually act as if their self-image-related expectations or their need for face will be respected in everyday social interactions.

Face-threatening acts (FTAs) are defined by (Johnson et al., 1988) based on two fundamental criteria: (1) Whose face is being threatened (the face of the recipient or the

speaker), and (2) What type of face is being threatened (positive or negative face). The actions that harm the recipient's positive face include all actions taken by the speaker that indicate a lack of support for the recipient's self-image or positive face (such as complaints, criticisms, accusations, mention of taboo topics, and interruptions). The actions that harm the recipients feel under pressure to accept or reject a future action (such as an offer or promise) or when the recipients think that the speaker is eager to get his or her way. Accepting compliments, self-depreciation, confessions, and apologies are some examples of FTAs that lead to a positive face of the speaker. Making a commitment, accepting an apology or offer, showing gratitude, and receiving thanks are some FTAs that can damage the speaker's reputation. Not only in sociolinguistic, face-threatening acts also studied in pragmatic while occurred on household conflict (Rahmansyah et al., 2020) even in situation that dealing with lives (Kirner-Ludwig & Fadhil Alsaedi, 2021). FTA is also found in the threat conversation of Iraqi students (Slman & Betti, 2020). Both FTA and FSA generally occur in the interaction or miscommunication of any social community.

On the other hand, contrary to popular belief, many Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS) research shown that interaction or miscommunication is not always the result of stylistic differences; conversely, miscommunication does not always result in conflict or stereotyping. As previously said, even severely divergent communication styles can be addressed by a willingness to see and acknowledge differences; on the other hand, the absence of difference does not always preclude negative identification or intentional misunderstanding. These results encourage us to go beyond the actual interactional environment and examine how interactants view and assess one another as differently positioned social beings who may perceive each other as deliciously or problematically different, depending on the situation. Especially in the way they showed politeness to each other. Put differently, IS demonstrates that communication is an inextricably social phenomenon that involves identities and relationships and, as such, is closely linked to broader social patterns and customs that are impacted by it (Paul & Handford, 2012). Even in the face of adversity, people may find other identities, traits, or behaviors valuable enough to overcome communication barriers and the negative effects of stereotyping. Accepting variety is, of course, essential for all people in the context of political interaction. Particularly in a country like Indonesia which is rich in diversity.

Political Debate in Presidential Election

Political contact is typically held on a periodic basis due to the requirement to replace government positions. The presidential candidate debate, hosted by the Indonesian government this year, included some really fascinating discussions. These discussions are readily available on the KPU RI YouTube account. The General Elections Commission, often known as *Komisi Pemilihan Umum* (abbreviated *KPU*), is the organization responsible for overseeing elections in Indonesia. Its duties encompass selecting political parties eligible to run for office, setting up the voting process, and declaring the outcomes and seats secured in the several bodies of government.

This year, the presidential election debate consisted of 3 candidates. The table below explains all of the candidate identities:

Table 1.

Descriptions of the Presidential Candidates

Political Party (KPU.go.id)	Representative (KPU.go.id)	Electability (RRI)
1. Partai NasDem, 2. Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa, 3. Partai Keadilan Sejahtera	Anies Rasyid Baswedan Muhaimin Iskandar	24,3
1. PDI Perjuangan, 2. Partai Persatuan Pembangunan, 3. Partai PERINDO, 4. Partai Hati Nurani Rakyat	Ganjar Pranowo Mahfud MD	51,9

1. Partai Gerakan Indonesia Raya,	Prabowo Subianto	18,17
2. Partai Golongan Karya,	Gibran Rakabuming Raka.	
3. Partai Demokrat,		
4. Partai Amanat Nasional,		
5. Partai Solidaritas Indonesia,		
6. Partai Bulan Bintang,		
7. Partai Garda Republik Indonesia		

The fascinating thing about interactional sociolinguistics in relation to politeness is that it highlights the existence of subtle cultural differences in the systematic combination of verbal and nonverbal signs that signal contexts and construct meaning, differences that are frequently difficult for those who use them to pinpoint. IS can take pride in having thoroughly demonstrated the dire consequences that may ensue if such disparate styles remain hidden and result in miscommunication in gatekeeping encounters: applicants not only lose out on a job or course admission but frequently find that their personal and ethnic background is the root of the communication breakdown (Paul & Handford, 2012).

The latest study about face-saving and face-threatening acts revealed several aspects that occurred as the substantive result of its study (Alejandro & Zhao, 2024). The aspect of face-saving acts spread from (1) Bald on-record, (2) Positive Politeness, (3) Negative Politeness, and (4) Off-record. The aspects of face-threatening are (1) Insult, (2) Disapproval, (3) Criticism, (4) Bringing Bad News, (5) Threat, (6) Non-Cooperation, and (7) Unleashed Negative Emotions.

The social significance of IS's discovery of the logic and meaning underlying communication patterns that are frequently labeled as illegible and nonsensical cannot be overstated. Research has demonstrated that even seemingly incomprehensible job candidates or uninterested kids can be thoughtful and engaged—as long as you can (and are willing to) interpret their contextualization cues correctly or are ready to embrace their distinct cueing patterns. IS is a great instrument for analyzing the conflict between established discursive processes and in-the-moment engagement. By scrutinizing interaction, IS demonstrates that communication is a constant process that requires cooperation, deception, and compromise.

As such, IS can be useful in identifying the precise moments at which established frames are questioned, rearranged, or otherwise changed. It can also serve as a marker for the emergence of novel and possibly habit-forming social configurations as a result of creative restructurings. To put it briefly, IS can advance our knowledge of more extensive social evolutions.

Material and Method

As this study looks at the sorts of politeness that are present in presidential candidate debates as well as the types that come up most frequently, and in order to maximize the study's findings, interaction sociolinguistic theory and discourse analysis were employed as research methods. The qualitative approach employed in this study, known as discourse analysis (DA), allowed for the study of written texts, spoken transcripts, and other data sets gathered to examine a social phenomenon. DA uses an analytical framework that views discourses as social activities made up of implicit and explicit components that form identities, norms, and perceptions. In this study, researchers analyze the video transcript of the 2024 Indonesian Presidential Election debate, entitled "The Third Debate of Presidential Candidates for the 2024 Election" on the Youtube channel "KPU RI". DA also a collection of methodology that provides particular instruments and approaches for empirically studying these processes. DA stands apart from other text analysis techniques due to its adaptable implementation. This adaptability presents both a benefit and a difficulty. Although it lets researchers create project-specific techniques, it also necessitates that they constantly

choose which tools are most appropriate for addressing their research subject (Bonnin & Coronel, 2021).

Furthermore, this study qualifies as a qualitative study using the Discourse Analysis (DA) approach because the data was verbal and would be explained in descriptive terms by converting it into transcripts. The use of the DA approach demonstrated the delicate and competitive nature of the presidential debate by connecting the candidates' intimidating behavior to both positive and negative politeness tactics. Discourse analysis further clarifies the connection between politeness strategy and its interactions. Below, researcher adopted the discourse analysis components to fit the analysis process that will be conducted in this study.

Table 2.

Component of discourse analysis adopted from (Calderón-Larrañaga et al., 2022)	
Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Familiarisation with the topic area • Underlining and marking of sections of transcripts with politeness • Reading while 'looking beyond the literal meanings of language'
Coding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection and organisation of data in two categories, positive and negative politeness (face-saving and face-threatening acts) • 'Pragmatic' (rather than an 'analytic') orientation • 'Inclusiveness' during data selection (e.g., data which seemed only vaguely related to the research questions were also included)
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of systematic patterns within the coded data in the form of both 'variability' (differences and contradictions in the content of accounts) and 'consistency' (similar features across accounts) • Development of hypothesis about the politeness acts found in the transcripts and the arguments being articulated and 'pushed' within (and across) discourses • Identification of 'interaction affinities' across texts to find the interesting interaction content
Validation	<p>Analytic techniques for the validation of study findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherence: The capacity to explain how the discourses and previous study fits together onto the identified politeness acts and interaction sociolinguistic. • Fruitfulness: The scope of our analytic scheme to facilitate understanding of new kinds of discourses and explain new phenomena. • Investigator triangulation: Convergence of findings across different evaluators through ongoing discussion within the research team.
Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing clarification and development of the analysis and findings • Detailed descriptions of data analysis and conclusions in order to allow the reader to assess and understand researchers' interpretations (e.g., linked researcher analytic claims to specific parts and aspects of the data or providing a representative set of examples)

Researchers are encouraged to read and reread the material after mapping the settings (visual, textual, socio-historical, of utterance) in which the textual material

investigated has been produced and/or received and undertaking an initial analysis focused on the explicit dimensions of the texts. Prior to searching for DA tools that would let researchers to provide empirical evidence of these mechanisms to an audience, this iterative method allows the inductive detection of trends or mechanisms within the material especially on FSA and FTA. Following the identification of the tools, researchers conduct a methodical analysis of the corpus, drawing on existing research on discursive mechanisms and contextual aspects to support the interpretation (Alejandro & Zhao, 2024). By doing this, DA facilitates thorough analysis of politeness data that might be found on the transcripts.

Results and Discussion

Results

The result this research is that there are 170 data points included in Politeness. And from these 170 data points, there are two types of Face in politeness that appear, namely Positive Face and Negative Face. Which includes face-threatening acts and face-saving acts. And the types that appears most often is the Positive Face, which has as many as 117 data points. In addition, the type of face that appears frequently in the positive face is the face-threatening act. On the other hand, the face-saving act often appears in the negative face. Below, the finding are displayed in three sections: (1) Positive Face, (2) Negative Face, and (3) Summary.

Positive Face

Table 3.

Summary of the positive face finding

Types		Frequencies	Dialog Sections
Face-Saving (FSA)	Acts	58	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 22, 25, 30, 34, 35, 36, 38, 41, 43, 44, 52, 53, 55, 57, 59, 60, 63, 64, 66, 68, 69, 74, 83, 85, 87, 89, 90, 92, 93, 108, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117
Face-Threatening Acts (FTA)		59	12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 37, 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 54, 56, 58, 61, 62, 65, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 88, 91, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 111

The dialogues above are positive face, because the actions and interactions in them express threatening and face-saving act that refers to positive face. As we can see from the table, there were 58 instances of face-saving acts (FSA) and 59 instances of face-threatening acts. The overall finding of the negative politeness summarized in below table:

Negative Face

Table 4.

Summary of the negative face finding

Types		Frequencies	Dialog Sections
Face-Saving (FSA)	Acts	39	2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53
Face-Threatening (FTA)	Acts	14	1, 4, 6, 9, 10, 18, 22, 23, 26, 31, 36, 40, 41, 42, 46, 47

From the total of 53 dialogs, there were 39 that marked as face-saving acts, and 14 that marked as face-threatening acts.

Discussion

Aspects

Several aspects of face-threatening acts (FTA) are found in the data, these aspects merge together into several categories that are (1) criticism, (2) threat, (3) interruption, (4) critical disagreement, (dismission or ignorance, and (6) demanding satisfying response. The face-saving acts that are found from the data spread from (1) providing equal opportunity, (2) clarifying and apologizing, (3) requesting cooperation, (4) agreement before giving critics and (5) providing equal opportunity.

The discussion that follows is split into two pieces for clarity. Discussing IS's approach to politeness will come first, followed by a discussion of the general analysis drawn from the video transcript regarding FSA and FTA.

a. Politeness, Discourse Analysis, and Interactional Sociolinguistics

In interactional sociolinguistics (IS) and discourse analysis, classifying dialogues as involving negative or positive politeness can be intricate, especially when both face-threatening acts (FTAs) and face-saving acts (FSAs) are present. The usage of IS as an approach in this study, combined with Discourse Analysis revealed significant findings listed above that worth to be discussed.

To be more precise, the integration of discourse analysis in qualitative research and the addition of IS in discourse analysis can offer a large dataset and a critical viewpoint for examining meaning in context, It turned out that this study's procedure is supported by Alejandro and Zhao's opinion in which their literature research stated that the combination of discourse analysis and a particular approach in qualitative research is frequently justified in a more open and explicit manner than other combinations of other qualitative data research methods (Alejandro & Zhao, 2024). It is worth mentioning that the overall findings in this study came from the interactional sociolinguistics perspective and discourse analysis in a qualitative study.

Eventhough IS covers a wide spread of disciplines, understanding Face-threatening Acts (FTAs) and Face-Saving Acts (FSAs) is crucial for comprehending how individuals navigate social interactions and maintain their social identities, thus helping us to understand the politeness and its complexity. These concepts, rooted in the theory of politeness, reveal the underlying dynamics of communication and power in various contexts such as presidential debates. In summary, the researcher successfully brings fascinating results by combining DA, IS, and Politeness approaches in this study. The results discussed in the following paragraphs are also linked with several aspects that correspond with several studies about politeness strategies (Aporbo et al., 2024; Bjørndal, 2020; Suparno et al., 2023).

b. Politeness Strategy

From the transcripts data, while the sample is debating, interactions where the frequent interruptions, criticisms, or demands—actions that threaten someone's face—might be classified as negative politeness. This is because the essence of negative politeness lies in preventing or mitigating disruptions while showing deference, even if the dialogue incorporates elements aimed at preserving face (Aporbo et al., 2024). Conversely, positive politeness is reflected in the usage of affirming language, expressions of appreciation, and efforts to demonstrate that the speaker values the other person. For instance, in a debate or discussion, positive politeness might be evident through frequent acknowledgments of each other's points, expressions of gratitude, or encouragement. These behaviors are designed to create a supportive and cooperative atmosphere, reinforcing positive social bonds rather than merely avoiding disruptions.

However, in the review articles of politeness summarized by (Baider et al., 2020), it is said that the significance of polite speech acts lies in their ability to disclose the influence of the circumstances surrounding their performance, such as the circumstances of production, the status of the instances involved in the relationship, etc. Since an act can be conducted directly or indirectly, "under the

cover of another language act," it can also be expanded to include an analysis of the manner in which they are carried out. Research about the functioning of speech acts at a more detailed level of analysis may focus specifically on the weight statements given to indirection, supportive movements, and/or the internal modifiers that make them up (Baider et al., 2020). This revealed that the level of politeness in the utterances is possible to be measured by how fatal it is given the age, status, or power of each speaker.

The dynamics of the interaction further complicate this classification. In dialogues dominated by FTAs, FSAs may be employed to balance or counteract these threats, but the pervasive nature of the FTAs can still define the interaction as negative politeness. For instance, if a moderator frequently interrupts to manage the discussion flow, these interruptions can threaten the participants' faces; however, when participants ignore the moderator's command, the discussion flow will be chaotic. This could be easily observed in data number 102.

Table 5.
Moderator's Interruptions

102.	Moderator 2: Okay, time's up! Mr. Prabowo: [<i>continues</i>]...all parties are participating. Moderator 1: Time's up, Mr. Prabowo! Time's up!	Face-threatening Act (Ignoring the moderator's reminder)
------	--	--

Despite these FTA's attempts (interruptions), the moderator's commands of maintaining order and avoiding chaos in the debate situation align with negative politeness principles, as the focus remains on minimizing disruptions and maintaining order. This indicates that, despite the impoliteness values it possessed, the moderator's negative politeness in a debating environment is vital and occasionally still required. Although a similar study from Aporbo revealed that face-threatening acts could damage people's positive self-perceptions and their need for approval (Aporbo et al., 2024), however, in this study, the face-threatening acts from the moderator did not damage the positive self-perception of debate participants. This might be due to the fact that the FTA are based on the rules that need to be obeyed by the debate participants. This means that the moderator's FTA could not harm anyone if it emerged from the rules in the debate situation.

In the other hand, in interactions where both FTAs and FSAs are present, positive politeness is illustrated by how participants manage to affirm each other's contributions and maintain a cooperative tone despite potential conflicts or disagreements. Even in the face of interruptions or criticisms, if the overall approach emphasizes shared goals, mutual respect, and a collaborative spirit, it reflects positive politeness. As Lambert cited in (Aporbo et al., 2024) said, a positive face is an attempt to win the respect and admiration of people. This strategy is characterized by an emphasis on relationship-building and demonstrating appreciation for the other person, thereby speak warm and supportive words that can balance or counteract the effects of face-threatening acts. A clear example of this can be seen in data number 89 as displayed below:

Table 6.
Supports and thanks

89.	.. but I thank Mr. Prabowo for explaining it. And hopefully, the public will be clear about his position.	Face-saving Act (Here, Mr. Ganjar still Respects Mr. Prabowo's explanation, so this action includes maintaining Mr. Prabowo positive face)
-----	--	--

In the scenario above, the speaker acknowledges and supports the viewpoint of another speaker, despite the fact that they hold opposing opinions. In summary, while FSAs are crucial for easing face threats and maintaining politeness, the overarching nature of the interaction—whether dominated by FTAs or focused on building relationships—determines whether it aligns more with negative or positive politeness. With this in mind, we could infer that negative politeness centers on managing and mitigating face threats, while positive politeness focuses on fostering connection and rapport, even in complex dialogues where both strategies are employed.

Face-threatening Acts (FTAs)

As explained by Lambert in (Aporbo et al., 2024), a face-threatening act (FTA) is an action that can cause someone to lose their "face," which is their sense of self-worth, or to be embarrassed in some other way, which could cause friction between the parties involved. The face is at risk in every interaction because these risks are common and pervasive. It is worth mentioning that, as explained by Goffman cited in (Nair, 2019), consideration should be given to three crucial "face" aspects. First, there is the practical management of self-images/faces. People subtly control the impressions they "give" (verbally) and "give off" (physically) in their daily performances in front of various audiences as a means of coping with society and either embodying or resisting accepted social roles. Managing face is "face-work," which is the daily practices of defending one's self-images against threats to one's own face (by politely withdrawing or switching topics, for example) and defending the faces of others (by politely extending one's hand, exercising discretion, studying non-observance, etc.). Secondly, a person's face represents not just an image of themselves, but also an emotionally charged version of themselves. A person's face before other people elicits an emotional reaction, both the agony of "shame" and "inferiority" when one "loses face" and the "confidence" and "assuredness" that one feels when one is "in the face" are comparable. Based on this, the FTA are analysed and resulted in several emergences:

a. Criticism

Several responses from all of the sample were noted as criticism. Criticism described as asking burdensome questions or making criticisms that are difficult to answer on the spot threatens the recipient's face by placing them in a position where they must defend themselves or their ideas under pressure. One tactic of impoliteness is to criticize someone directly. Being impolite, especially when it involves direct criticism, is seen as offensive behavior that can lead to conflicts and issues (Aporbo et al., 2024). These could disrupt the flow of interaction and impact how participants are perceived, potentially leading to a defensive stance or loss of authority. Such interactions also reveal how individuals manage conflict and negotiate their social standing in high-stakes environments. For example, criticism could be identified in data number 81 below:

Table 7.
Critics of ethics

81. I don't think you have the right to talk about ethics. Because you set a bad example about ethics. Thank you!	Face-threatening Act (Providing heated criticism is a face-threatening act)
-----	--	---

In the examples that shown above, the speaker employed a face-threatening critics about ethics and how the other debate participant speech does not match with his attitude. This part can be effectively analyzed by using the concept of "contextualization," which refers to the act of choosing, rejecting, modifying, and/or (re)negotiating the pertinent context in order to determine what implicit extra-communicative knowledge adds to or clarifies the meaning of what was said (Paul &

Handford, 2012). Using the Interactional Sociolinguistics approach, we could infer that after this utterance, the participant loses face and needs to gain its face again.

b. Threat

The response that questions someone's response for its lack of truth or discrepancy with the previous response or action. Below is example of threats to the image of other speakers.

Table 8.
Threat to the other participants image

104.	There is nothing to keep secret! Mr. President said that you have more than 340,000 hectares of land. While our TNI, more than half of our soldiers do not have official houses, that's a fact!	Face-threatening Act (Criticizing and cornering)
------	---	---

The threat mentioned in the speaker's speech above is the possibility of harming the other participants' confidence or sense of self. This causes the other speakers to suffer a "face loss." The speaker's authority, or their capacity to sway others in accordance with their own desires, may be harmed by these "face-loss" situations. The interaction between those with the capacity to impose influence—either voluntarily or involuntarily—on other parties that are subject to that influence determines the existence of power (Suparno et al., 2023).

c. Interruption

Acts like interrupting someone's speech or calling for quiet disrupt the speaker's freedom and autonomy, threatening their face. Interruption during speech can be seen as a direct challenge to the speaker's autonomy and freedom. It threatens the speaker's negative face by asserting control over their speaking time and content. This can have significant implications in formal settings like debates or public discussions, where the balance of power and respect is crucial. FTAs such as these can affect the speaker's ability to fully articulate their points, potentially diminishing their credibility and influence.

Table 9.
Moderator interruptions

102.	Moderator 2: Okay, time's up! Mr. Prabowo: [continues]...all parties are participating. Moderator 1: Time's up, Mr. Prabowo! Time's up!	Face-threatening Act (Ignoring the moderator's remind)
------	---	---

The speaker in this segment disregarded the moderator's directive and continued speaking, making a threat to the moderator's face. As a result, one moderator helped another maintain their authority over the participant. Their actions are required even if it was the moderator who initiated the face-threatening act first. This incident suggested that the face-losing interruption was occasionally essential even though it made other speakers uncomfortable.

d. Critical Disagreement

Disagreement without providing a chance for an adequate response threatens the recipient's face. Below are the examples of the critical disagreement.

Table 10.
Disagreement

105.	There is no need to discuss it behind closed doors. That is a shortcoming that we must fix and when you said earlier you will improve welfare.	Face-threatening Act (Disagreement)
------	---	-------------------------------------

The speaker expressed the disagreement as a part of critics to emphasize his opinion. The critics and disagreements imply that several aspects of face-threatening act could blend between each other. The act's threat is more likely to be harmful to the other speaker's face as a result of the blended face-threatening act. This is especially true since saving face and threatening face is an action with particular results and repercussions that is performed onto the world. This idea emphasizes the active role that face-saving techniques play in facilitating the performances of status equality and sovereign equality, as opposed to status serving as a passive synonym for status (Nair, 2019).

e. Dismissal or Ignorance

Actions or remarks that belittle or undermine the speaker's statements or position (e.g., ignoring other's responses). Remarks that belittle or undermine a speaker's position are particularly potent forms of FTAs. They not only challenge the speaker's arguments but also attack their social identity and competence. This form of face threat can lead to a significant shift in the dynamics of an interaction, impacting relationships and the perceived legitimacy of the speaker's contributions. Analyzing such behaviors helps in understanding the power dynamics and social hierarchies at play (Nair, 2019), which really relates to the politeness strategy while interacting.

Table 11.
Audience ignoring moderator's command

37.	Moderator 1: Can you take care of it? Okay, we will continue our program this evening. We agree to] maintain order. [Cheering] [Gives code for silence] Moderator 2: Okay. Please be quiet! Okay to the three presidential candidates, Mr. Anies Baswedan, Mr. Prabowo Subianto, and Mr. Ganjar Pranowo. [Cheering] Moderator 1 : Quiet, please! Moderator 2 : We have agreed, ladies and gentlemen. Moderator 1 : We agreed earlier to maintain order.	Face-threatening Act (The audience did not listen to the moderator's reminder and made a noise)
-----	---	---

f. Demanding satisfying responses

The participant often demands satisfying response because the opinion from other participants are not enough or not satisfying. Below are a few examples of this aspect:

Table 12.
Few examples of demanding a satisfying response

19.	Including when we make submarines that have started from PT PAL, whose cooperation, if I'm not mistaken, you canceled with South Korea. Please sir, if	Face-saving Act (Politely asking for an explanation is a face-saving act)
-----	--	---

I am wrong, this is your chance to explain.

40.	I want the data that you say is wrong for your defense data. My defense data, please refute it here. You were unable to refute and you explained the second-hand Aircraft	Face-threatening Act (A demand that burdens the other person is a face threatening act)
106.	Sir, you have been MENHAN for 5 years, 4 years almost 5 years, not a MENHAN candidate. So you should show what have done, not say what will be done.	Face-Threatening Act (Providing heated criticism is a face-threatening act)

The demand from the other speaker may have resulted from the response failing to satisfy the participant's expectations or image of the answer. This could be interpreted from the video and the transcripts. After all, articulation rate, pitch, loudness, and intonation are meaningless in and of themselves; they only become meaningful when understood within a particular context (Paul & Handford, 2012).

Face-saving Acts (FSAs)

A positive face represents a person's demands and desires to be liked, and accepted, and to have their desires desired by others. The positive face-threatening act is the result of a speaker or listener ignoring the desires or feelings of their interlocutor (Aporbo et al., 2024). These actions express the speaker's disapproval of the hearer's positive face, or a portion of it.

a. Providing Equal Opportunity

Offering equal time and opportunities to all candidates helps in maintaining a balance and respecting their speaking rights (e.g., statements like “You have one minute!” or “We invite Mr. Ganjar to respond”). The coordination carried out by moderators is called relational nature; it refers to the system that governs interpersonal interactions and connections among community members in order to promote peace within the community (Suparno et al., 2023).

Table 13.

Moderator provide equal equal opportunities to the participants

37.	Moderator 2: Time's up! Moderator 1: Okay, time's up! Moderator 2: Okay, Mr. Prabowo, please answer questions from Mr. Ganjar. You have 2 minutes, Please	Face-saving Act (Providing equal opportunity and freedom is a face-saving act)
38.	Moderator 1: Time is up Mr. Prabowo, thank you! [Applause] Moderator 1: We welcome Mr. Ganjar to respond to Mr. Prabowo's answer. Your time is 1 minute.	Face-saving Act (Providing equal opportunity and freedom is a face-saving act)

b. Clarifying and Apologizing

Clarifying incorrect information, apologizing for misunderstandings, or

explaining reasons for interruptions can help to save face and rectify situations (e.g., correcting data errors or offering explanations for time constraints). Clarifications and apologies are vital for managing misunderstandings and correcting errors. By addressing mistakes and offering explanations, participants can repair any damage to their faces and restore the interactional equilibrium. These acts demonstrate a commitment to mutual understanding and respect, which is essential for maintaining constructive and cooperative dialogue.

Table 14.
Clarifying opinions and data

3.	Thank you. Before I answer the question, I clarify the data that was missed. Sorry Mr. Prabowo, the number is too small. It is not 320 hectares but 340,000 hectares. I clarified, then...	Face-saving Act (Mr. Anies did a face-saving act against Mr. Prabowo's negative number is too small. To avoid criticism and hectares but 340,000 hectares. I maintain his own positive face.)
6.	Mr. Prabowo, I am very happy that you triggered me that my data is not correct.	Face-threatening Act (Giving criticism and also the actions such as respecting others' explanations are face saving act in the negative face)

c. Requesting Cooperation

In this section, Asking the audience to maintain order or cooperate helps in preserving a respectful environment, thereby supporting the participants' faces. Requests for audience cooperation to maintain order and focus help to manage the interactional space effectively. By ensuring that all participants adhere to agreed-upon norms and procedures, FSAs facilitate smoother and more respectful exchanges. This helps to protect the participants' faces and ensures that the interaction remains productive and aligned with its goals.

Table 15.
Moderators requesting audience cooperation

50.	Please cooperate ladies and gentlemen! Because there are millions of people at home who also have the right to follow this event with peace of mind	Face-saving Act (Providing equal opportunity and freedom is a face-saving act)
51.	And we have agreed from the beginning and it has also been clearly stated in the order. That ladies and gentlemen who are here must be calm!	Face-saving Act (Politely reminding is a face-saving act)

d. Agreement while giving critics

Several responses are noted to express the satisfy or pleased with other responses before giving another arguments. The example below provides the clearest example of critics-agreement.

Table 16.
Participants raise other faces before giving critics or opinion

88.	Yes, at first I believed that you would understand that. But today I became doubtful.	Face-threatening Act (Mr. Ganjar statement that he doubts Mr. Prabowo is an act of threatening Mr. Prabowo positive face)
-----	---	---

-
89. ... but I thank Mr. Prabowo for Face-saving Act explaining it. And hopefully, the public (But here Mr. Ganjar still Respects will be clear about his position. Mr. Prabowo explanation, so this action includes maintaining Mr. Prabowo positive face)
-

e. Providing Equal Opportunity

Ensuring that all participants have equal time and opportunity to speak is a critical aspect of FSAs. It helps to balance the interaction and ensures that no single participant is unfairly marginalized. This act of maintaining fairness is crucial in preserving the integrity of the interaction and fostering a respectful environment. FSAs like these are important as they contribute to the overall harmony and effectiveness of the communication process.

Table 17.

Moderator establishes the rules

-
12. So we ask for the cooperation and commitment of the audience from ladies and gentlemen to (Explaining is a face-maintain order. And give equal rights to the saving act) presidential candidates who are speaking, to be able to show their best performance.
-

As displayed in the examples above, the moderator asks the audience to give the right to speak even though the position of the presidential candidates that the speaker has is higher than all of the audience. But here, the moderators respect the existence of the audiences. This could be observed in the act of the moderator, either verbally or non-verbally.

In summary, after all of the discussion above, the key contribution of IS to the study of language and social interaction is the discovery that interactants use a wide range of signaling channels in addition to words to convey contextual information. These channels can be vocal (prosodic qualities like intonation or accent, code-switches, style shifts) or non-vocal (gaze, gesture, mimics, posture) and are employed in co-occurrence with words. Usually referred to as "contextualization cues," these signals serve as suggestions or clues that "steer the interpretation of the words they accompany" or help place the conversation in perspective (Fuhse, 2023). In this study, we were able to delve deeply into the presidential candidates' use of civility throughout their debates.

Conclusion

The study of FTAs and FSAs provides valuable insights into how individuals negotiate social roles, manage interpersonal relationships, and maintain social order. In interactional sociolinguistics, these concepts help explain the strategies people use to navigate complex social interactions and uphold their social identities. They also reveal how power, respect, and authority are negotiated through language, influencing both individual experiences and broader social dynamics. These reasons are why we use IS on discourse analysis to analyze politeness strategies in presidential debates in the video of the 2024 Presidential Election Debate on the KPU RI channel. The results showed that there were more utterances with positive faces, 117 points. Compared to the negative faces which is only 53 points. The identified aspects of Face-threatening Acts (FTAs) are criticism, threat, interruption, critical disagreement, dismissal or ignorance, and demanding a satisfying response. Face-saving Acts (FSAs) identified aspects are: providing equal opportunity, clarifying and apologizing, requesting cooperation, agreement while giving criticism, and

providing equal opportunity. Overall, this study shows that the presidential candidates in the 2024 Presidential Election Debate video on the KPU RI channel use various language politeness strategies in their conversations and interactions to achieve their goals. The strategies used vary depending on the situation and the goals to be achieved. Nonetheless, this study demonstrates that it is possible to quantify each utterance's politeness degree by considering external and internal factors that contribute to politeness acts. This study also demonstrates the value of employing interactional sociolinguistics as a methodology and how politeness strategies emerged in the presidential heated debate. These findings might inspire other researchers in the next study.

References

- Agustine, S., Asi, N., & Luardini, M. A. (2021). Language Use in EFL Classroom Interaction: A Sociolinguistic Study. *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(4), 372–381. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i4.23598>.
- Alejandro, A., & Zhao, L. (2024). Multi-Method Qualitative Text and Discourse Analysis: A Methodological Framework. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 30(6), 461–473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004231184421>.
- Aporbo, R. J., Barabag, J. M. C., Catig, B. U., & Claveria, C. M. P. (2024). Face-threatening and Face-saving Speech Acts of Teachers: A Discourse Analysis of Classroom Interactions. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(3), 413–439. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n3p413>.
- Baider, F. H., Cislaru, G., & Claudel, C. (2020). Researching Politeness: From the 'Classical' Approach to Discourse Analysis ... and Back. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 4(3), 259–272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-020-00088-8>.
- Banda, F. (2020). Sociolinguistics and modes of social class signalling: African perspectives. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 24(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12409>.
- Bjørndal, C. R. P. (2020). Student teachers' responses to critical mentor feedback: A study of face-saving strategies in teaching placements. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 91, 103047. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103047>.
- Bonnin, J. E., & Coronel, A. A. (2021). Attitudes Toward Gender-Neutral Spanish: Acceptability and Adoptability. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 6(March), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2021.629616>.
- Calderón-Larrañaga, S., Greenhalgh, T., Finer, S., & Clinch, M. (2022). What does the literature mean by social prescribing? A critical review using discourse analysis. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 44(4–5), 848–868. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.13468>.
- Canagarajah, S. (2020). Transnational work, translingual practices, and interactional sociolinguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 24(5), 555–573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12440>.
- Dippold, C., Commons, C., Works, A. D., & This, P. (2020). *Citation*. 100432.
- Feng, W., & Ren, W. (2020). Impoliteness in negative online consumer reviews: A cross-language and cross-sector comparison. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 17(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2020-0001>.
- Fuhse, J. A. (2023). Analyzing networks in communication: a mixed methods study of a political debate. *Quality and Quantity*, 57(2), 1207–1230. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-022-01394-w>.
- Johnson, D. M., Yang, A. W., Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1988). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4). *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(4), 660. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587263>.
- Kádár, D. Z., Parvaresh, V., & Reiter, R. M. (2021). Alternative Approaches to Politeness and Impoliteness: An Introduction. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 17(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2020-0028>.
- Kirner-Ludwig, M., & Fadhil Alsaedi, R. (2021). A Pragmatics-based Appeal to Saving Face

- so as to Save Lives: On Intercultural Pragmatic Awareness (or rather: Lack thereof) in a Handbook for US Soldiers Deployed for Iraq. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 50(3), 225–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2020.1869581>.
- Masruddin, M., Amir, F., Langaji, A., & Rusdiansyah, R. (2023). Conceptualizing Linguistic Politeness in Light of Age. *International Journal of Society, Culture and Language*, 11(3), 41–55. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijsc.2023.2001556.3018>.
- Nair, D. (2019). Saving face in diplomacy: A political sociology of face-to-face interactions in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. *European Journal of International Relations*, 25(3), 672–697. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066118822117>.
- Paul, J., & Handford, M. (2012). The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis. In *Choice Reviews Online* (Vol. 50, Issue 02). <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.50-0712>.
- Rahmansyah, S., Nur, T., Marta, D. C. V., & Indrayani, L. M. (2020). The Impact of Face Threatening Acts on Hearer (The Wife) Face in A Household Conflict: A Pragmatic Study. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 3(1), 140–149. <https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v3i1.9427>.
- Slman, H. S., & Betti, M. J. (2020). Politeness and Face Threatening Acts in Iraqi EFL learners' Conversations. *Glossa: A Journal Of General Linguistics*, 3(8), 222–233. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344637114>.
- Stenzel, K., & Williams, N. (2021). Toward an interactional approach to multilingualism: Ideologies and practices in the northwest Amazon. *Language and Communication*, 80, 136–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2021.05.010>.
- Suparno, D., Fitriana, I., Nadra, N., Gunawan, F., & Boulahnane, S. (2023). Redefining politeness: Power and status in the digital age. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2218195>.
- Suyono, M., & Andriyanti, E. (2021). Negative Politeness Strategies in What Would You Do? TV Show. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 21(2), 439–452. <https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v21i2.3430>.
- Toomaneejinda, A., & Saengboon, S. (2022). Interactional Sociolinguistics: The Theoretical Framework and Methodological Approach to ELF Interaction Research. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(1), 156–179.

