

POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED BY THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES OF INDONESIA IN THE 2019 PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

Meida Rabia Sihite

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP, Universitas Alwashliyah, Medan
Email: meidarabia55@gmail.com

Sofia Idawati Lubis

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP, Universitas Alwashliyah, Medan
Email: sofya.romianda@gmail.com

Devi Meitina Astuty Silalahi

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP, Universitas Alwashliyah, Medan
Email: devi123merahani@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Presidential debate is one of an interesting examples to be analyzed in terms of politeness strategies. This research analyzed the politeness strategies used by the presidential candidates of Indonesia in a presidential debate program during the election period in 2019. This research employed qualitative descriptive. The data were in the form of spoken utterances which were collected from the debate participants. The sources of the data in this research were the videos and transcripts of the second and the fourth presidential debates taken from youtube and google. The data were analyzed using data condensation, data displayed, drawing and verifying conclusion. The results of the research showed that the presidential candidates used several types of politeness strategies and realizations of politeness. There were four types of politeness strategies found in the debates; they were Bald-On Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, and Off Record. In realizations of politeness strategies, there were 30 sub-strategies realized in the second debate and 33 sub-strategies realized in the fourth debate. Positive Politeness was found as the dominant strategy since the candidates wanted to omit any gaps, give good sense, choose words selectively and convey their campaign.

Keywords: politeness strategies, presidential debates, spoken utterances

ABSTRAK

Debat presiden merupakan salah satu contoh menarik untuk dianalisis dari segi strategi kesopanan. Penelitian ini menganalisis strategi kesopanan yang digunakan oleh calon presiden Indonesia dalam program debat presiden selama periode pemilu 2019. Penelitian ini menggunakan deskriptif kualitatif. Data berupa ucapan lisan yang dikumpulkan dari peserta debat. Sumber data penelitian ini adalah video dan transkrip debat presiden kedua dan keempat yang diambil dari youtube dan google. Analisis data menggunakan data kondensasi, penyajian data, penarikan kesimpulan dan verifikasi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa calon presiden menggunakan beberapa jenis strategi kesopanan dan realisasi kesopanan. Ada empat jenis strategi kesopanan yang ditemukan dalam debat, yaitu Bald-On Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, and Off Record. Dalam realisasi strategi kesopanan, terdapat 30 sub-strategi yang direalisasikan pada debat kedua dan 33 sub-strategi yang direalisasikan pada debat keempat. Positive Politeness merupakan strategi dominan karena para calon ingin menghilangkan celah, memberi pemikiran yang baik, memilih kata-kata secara selektif dan menyampaikan kampanye mereka.

Kata kunci: strategi kesopanan, debat presiden, ujaran

A. Introduction

Politeness is an important subject matter in a communication. It is concerning on how people consider several choices of what they want to say, how they say it, and with whom they are speaking to make a good communication. This strategy is very essential because it is a communication form that can make people respect each other and less chance of developing enemies. As Kádár and Haugh (2013) say that politeness is key to all of our relationships and plays a fundamental part in the way we communicate with each other and the way we define ourselves. Thus, this matter teaches people how to maintain the relationship well with others through language.

But in fact, there are still many people who do not think wisely when choosing some words considered polite and impolite, or they often use impolite language to express their anger. It is getting worse if they come from politicians or public figures which often appear on television and watched by many people. Of course, what they say will become something that is most imitated and inspired. For example, a politician who is often criticized for his communication style, he is Basuki Tjahaja Purnama or familiarly called Ahok, the former governor of Jakarta. According to Yellowcabin (2015), many people think that Ahok is too sarcastic and impolite. Islahudin (2013) mentions impolite words that Ahok had uttered are: *bajingan*, *bego*, and *brengsek*. Those words even became public debate. Mubarakan (2015) says during a live interview on Kompas TV, Ahok repeatedly uttered such the word “tai” to describe the behavior of members of Regional People’s Representative Assembly (DPRD) of DKI Jakarta.

Ahok got a lot of critics regarding the impolite language he used when he appeared live on Kompas TV. One of them came from Azaz Tigor Nainggolan, *Ketua Forum Warga Kota Jakarta (Fakta)*. Rmo1Jakarta (2015) “*Wah sudah keterlaluan dan sudah tidak sopan sama sekali. Kok seorang gubernur, Ahok bicara kotor seperti itu di media publik, di televisi pula di Kompas*

TV”. He also adds that the impolite language used by Ahok could give a very bad example to the citizens of Jakarta. As a governor, Ahok should be able to control himself by not saying such the words.

Based on the fact above, it can be concluded that impolite language is inappropriate to say, especially if it is said by someone who has a big name like Ahok, it will only bring a negative impact on the people especially the younger generations. Indeed, anyone has the right to be angry and upset, but one must remember to control the language being used because the use of impolite language will only make social conflict.

Communication occurs not only in informal setting but also in formal setting. For example in debate. Freely and Steinberg (2009:6) define a debate as a process of finding a reasoned judgement on a proposition. A proposition means a statement or assertion that expresses a judgment or opinion. They also state that the debate is used to influence the audience. In politics field, debate is very crucial to be mastered to win the campaign. According to Jazeri (2018:364), communication in the political debate is aimed at winning voters’ support. One example of communication in the political debate is the presidential debate.

Presidential debate is an important moment for people to know the quality of a presidential candidate that will lead them. It is the time to see what strategies are being used by the presidential candidates to influence them. A presidential debate is usually illustrated as a full tension situation from both candidates. Each candidate tries to kill, struggle or even maintain their strong arguments to attract appreciation from audience. In such a situation, they will tend to use politeness strategies in order to win the elections session elegantly and get greatest appreciation from voters. Jazeri (2018:365) states that in addition to performance and character during the debate, to win the voters support the presidential candidates ought to communicate politely since politeness is one of the main Indonesian cultural characteristics.

Related to the explanation above, it is important to analyze the politeness strategies used by the presidential candidates of Indonesia in the 2019 presidential debates.

There are four types of politeness strategies described by Brown and Levinson (1987). They are Bald-On Record (BOR), Positive Politeness (PP), Negative Politeness (NP) and Off-Record (OR).

1. Bald-On Record (BOR)

BOR is called as a doing act baldly. In using this strategy, the speaker directly, clearly, unambiguously and shortly tells what she/he wants toward the hearer. In addition, this strategy is often used by somebody who knows well each other. Therefore, the S is mostly higher power than the H.

2. Positive Politeness (PP)

This strategy is oriented to satisfy hearer's positive face. The speaker shows the intimacy to the hearer as indicates each other interest and approval. This strategy also implies S and H's common ground as they want to come closer.

3. Negative Politeness (NP)

When people talk to someone whom they do not know well yet, people prefer to use such mitigating word. NP enjoins the speaker to question or hedge such assumptions. People applied this strategy by starting with word or phrase which contains apologizing and word "think". By using NP, S could pay respect maintain social distance and avoid threat.

4. Off-Record (OR)

This strategy exploits ambiguity in the wider sense. OR contains less information or sometimes different with the fact. By using OR strategy, S could run less risk of his act and avoid responsibility for the potentially face-damaging interpretation.

There are also some previous researches related to politeness strategies. One of them is "Politeness Strategy used in Republican Debate by

Donal Trump" analyzed by Sibarani and Marlina (2018). The finding of the study elucidated that Donald Trump in his debate used positive politeness dominantly. It reached 55.2%. It indicated that Trump used positive politeness because he wanted to provide an effort to make a good relationship with Hillary and the audiences.

Another politeness research by Archia (2014) entitled "A Pragmatic Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies as Reflected by the Characters in Camage Movie" aimed to find out the types of positive politeness strategies and the maxim violatin when the characters used the positive politeness strategies. The researcher used Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness strategies (1987) and Grice's theory of cooperative principles (1975). It was found out that there were 67 data on the dialogue of the movie which contained positive politeness strategies. The percentage of noticing, attending to H (her/his interests, wants, needs, goods, etc) strategy was 16.42%. It means that it happened 11 times and it was noted as the highest rank. Meanwhile, the strategies of asserting or presupposing knowledge of and concerning for hearer's wants and giving or asking for reasons were in the lowest rank. Both of them only occurred once and had the smallest percentage that was 1.49%. Violation of cooperative principle in expressing positive politeness strategies, in this research applied 3 types of maxim violating out of 4 types.

The last research related to politeness strategies was conducted by Hasmi (2013) entitled "A Pragmatic Analysis of Politeness Strategies Reflected in Nanny McPhee Movie". Hasmi analyzed the types of politeness strategies employed by the main characters in Nanny McPhee movie and analyzed the way politeness strategies were realized in the utterances employed by the main characters in Nanny McPhee movie. In analyzing data, she used descriptive qualitative method. The data source was Nanny McPhee movie script and collected by note-taking technique to classify and analyze. The result of this research showed that positive politeness had the highest

frequency (46 out of 104) among other strategies, Bald-On Record (31), Negative Politeness (15), and Off Record(12).

The similarity of those three research with this research is analyzing the use of politeness strategies in a language. However, the difference is on the object of the study. Sibarani and Marlina (2018) analyzed the use of politeness in debate. Hasmi (2013) analyzed politeness in a movie. It is accordingly with Hasmi (2013) that the object was a movie. Among those three, this current research is almost similar to the research entitled “Politeness Strategy Used in Republican Debate by Donald Trump” analyzed by Sibarani and Marlina (2018). The similarity is the research was aimed to analyze the debate transcript, the difference is on the debate participants. They analyzed the utterances produced by Trump while this research analyzed the utterances produced by the presidential candidates of Indonesia, Jokowi and Prabowo.

B. Research Method

This research applied a qualitative descriptive method since it described phenomenon in the society, especially related to linguistics problem, which is the application of politeness. The data of this research were in form of spoken utterances which were collected from debate participants. The sources of the data in this research were the videos and transcripts of presidential debates of 2019 taken from youtube and google. The data were collected by downloading the debate videos from youtube, taking the debate transcripts from google, watching and listening the debate videos repeatedly in order to get the utterances fully understood, checking both the debate videos and the debate transcripts in order to have accurate data, and reading the debate transcripts repeatedly.

According to Miles and Hubberman (2014), there are three main components in analyzing the data, namely: data condensation, data display, drawing and verifying conclusion. This theory was employed to analyzed the data. Data condensation became the first step to do in this research. It is the process of selecting,

focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data in written up field note or transcript. The second step was data display. Generally, a display is an organized assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action taking. After completing the data condensation and the data display, the last step to do in this research was drawing and verifying conclusion. Conclusion is drawn based on the data display. This step elaborates the data with lengthy argumentation to replicate a finding in another data set. In this last step, the data were described and interpreted in order to answer the research problems.

C. Research Finding and Discussion

In the second and fourth debates, both of candidates, Jokowi and Prabowo used some strategies in the sentences they uttered. The strategies are divided into Bald-On Record (BOR), Positive Politeness (PP), Negative Politeness (NP), and Off-Record (NP). Those strategies will be described briefly in the following tables.

Table 1. Politeness strategies in the Second Debate

POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED IN THE 2 ND DEBATE	CANDIDATE	
	JKW (01)	PRA (02)
Bald On-Record (BOR)		
Showing disagreement	✓	✓
Giving suggestion	✓	✓
Requesting	-	✓
Warning	✓	✓
Using imperative Form	✓	✓
Positive Politeness (PP)		
Noticing, attending to H	✓	-
Exaggerating	-	✓
Intensifying interest to H	✓	-
Using in-group identity markers	-	✓
Seeking agreement	-	✓
Avoiding disagreement	-	✓
Presupposing/raising/asse rting common ground	✓	✓
Joking	-	✓

Asserting or presupposing knowledge of and concern for H's wants	✓	-
Offering, promising	✓	✓
Being optimistic	✓	✓
Including both S and H in the activity	✓	✓
Giving (or asking) for reason	✓	✓
Giving gifts to H	✓	-
Negative Politeness (NP)		
Being indirect	✓	-
Questioning, hedging	✓	-
Impersonalizing	-	✓
Stating the FTA as a general rule	-	✓
Off-Record (OR)		
Understating	-	✓
Using contradiction	-	-
Being ironic	-	-
Using rhetorical questions	-	✓
Over-generalizing	✓	✓
Displacing H	✓	-
Being incomplete	✓	✓

the activity		
Giving (or asking) for reason	✓	✓
Giving gifts to H	✓	✓
Negative Politeness (NP)		
Questioning, hedging	✓	✓
Giving deference	-	✓
Apologizing	-	✓
Stating the FTA as a general rule	-	✓
Going on record as incurring a debt	✓	-
Off-Record (OR)		
Giving hints	-	✓
Understating	-	✓
Overstating	-	✓
Using tautologies	-	✓
Using contradictions	✓	-
Using metaphors	-	✓
Being ironic	-	✓
Using rhetorical questions	-	✓
Being Vague	-	✓
Over-generalizing		
Being incomplete	-	✓

Table 2. Politeness strategies in the Fourth Debate

POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED IN THE 4 TH DEBATE	CANDIDATE	
	JKW (01)	PRA (02)
Bald On-Record (BOR)		
Showing disagreement	✓	-
Giving suggestion	✓	✓
Requesting	-	✓
Warning	✓	✓
Using imperative Form	-	✓
Positive Politeness (PP)		
Noticing, attending to H	-	-
Intensifying interest to H	✓	✓
Using in-group identity markers	-	✓
Seeking agreement	✓	-
Avoiding disagreement	✓	✓
Presupposing/raising/asserting common ground	✓	✓
Joking	-	-
Offering, promising	✓	✓
Being optimistic	✓	-
Including both S and H in	✓	✓

The tables above showed the classification of politeness strategies used in the second and the fourth presidential debates. There were 30 sub-strategies found in the second debate and 33 sub-strategies found in the fourth debate.

Sub-strategies found in the second debate were as follow:

BOR: Showing disagreement 5 (19.23%), Giving suggestion 12 (46.15%), Requesting 1 (3.84%), Warning 3 (11.53%), Using imperative form 5 (19,23%)

PP: Noticing, Attending to H 1 (1.78%), Exaggerating 1 (1.78%), Intensifying interest to H 4 (7.14%), Using in-group identity markers 1 (1.78%), Seeking agreement 3 (5.35%), Avoiding disagreement 10 (17.85), Presupposing, raising, asserting common ground 4 (7.14%), Joking 1 (1.78%), Asserting or presupposing knowledge of and concern for H's wants 1 (1.78%), Offering, promising 10 (17.85), Being optimistic 8 (14.28%), Including both S and H in the activity 5 (8.92%), Giving (or asking) for reason 4 (7.14%), Giving gifts to H 3 (5.35%)

NP: Being indirect 1 (4.76%), Questioning, hedging 17 (80.95%), Impersonalizing 1 (4.76%), Stating the FTA as a general rule 2 (9.52)

OR: Understating 1 (7.69), Using Contradiction 1 (7.69), Being ironic 1 (7.69), Using rhetorical questions 2 (15.38), Over-generalizing 3 (23.07%), Displacing H 1 (7.69), Being incomplete 4 (30.76%).

Sub-strategies found in the fourth debate were as follow:

BOR: Showing disagreement 2 (6.25%), Giving suggestion 18 (56.25%), Requesting 2 (6.25%), Warning 9 (28.12%), Using imperative form 1 (3.12%)

PP: Noticing, attending to H 1 (2.08%), Intensifying interest to H 7 (14.58%), Using in-group identity markers 1 (2.08%), Seeking agreement 1 (2.08%), Avoiding disagreement 6

(12.5%), Presupposing/raising/asserting common ground 5 (10.41%), Joking 3 (6.25%), Offering, promising 4 (8.33%), Being optimistic 6 (12.5%), Including both S and H in the activity 6 (12.5%), Giving (or asking) for reason 5 (10.41%), Giving gifts to H 3 (6.25%)

NP: Questioning, hedging 19 (67.85%), Giving deference 2 (7.14%), Apologizing 5 (17.85%), Stating the FTA as a general rule 1 (3.57%), Going on record as incurring a debt 1 (3.57%)

OR: Giving hints 1 (4.76), Understating 1 (4.76), Overstating 1 (4.76), Using tautologies 1 (4.76), Using contradictions 1 (4.76), Using metaphors 1 (4.76), Being ironic 2 (9.52%), Using rhetorical questions 10 (47.61), Being vague 1 (4.76), Over-generalizing 1 (4.76), Being incomplete 1 (4.76).

Table 3. The Calculations of Politeness Strategies in the Second Debate

No.	Types of Politeness	Total	Percentage
1.	Bald-On Record (BOR)	26	22.41%
2.	Positive Politeness (PP)	56	48.27%
3.	Negative	21	18.10%

	Politeness (NP)		
4.	Off-Record (OR)	13	11.20%

Table 4. The Calculations of Politeness Strategies in the Fourth Debate

No.	Types of Politeness	Total	Percentage
1.	Bald-On Record (BOR)	32	24.80%
2.	Positive Politeness (PP)	48	37.20%
3.	Negative Politeness (NP)	28	21.70%
4.	Off-Record (OR)	21	16.27%

From the tables above, the positive politeness strategy became the most widely used strategy; BOR stood in the second place, NP in the third place and OR perched in the last position.

The deeper explanation about the realizations of politeness strategies performed by the presidential candidates will be shown as follows.

1. Bald-On Record (BOR)

- Showing disagreement

Datum 1 (JKW/9/D2)

Ya kalau tadi Pak Prabowo menyampaikan tanpa feasibility study saya kira salah besar, karena ini sudah direncanakan lama. Ini sudah direncanakan lama, tentu saja semuanya ada dan ada juga DED nya, semuanya ada.

The utterance above shows Jokowi's response toward Prabowo's response to his strategy. Prabowo said to him that his team worked less efficiently and no feasibility study or without correct feasibility study in bulding the previous infrastructure. Jokowi used politeness strategy to utter his disagreement. The politeness strategy used by him was Bold On-Record which was Showing

Disagreement by saying “*saya kira salah besar...*”.

Datum 2 (PRA/29/D2)

...saya bukan pesimis Pak, saya sangat optimis kita mampu untuk, kita sangat mampu untuk swasembada di bidang energi dan kelapa sawit, akan menjanjikan.

The utterance above shows Prabowo's response toward Jokowi's statement. Jokowi said Prabowo looked pessimistic about Industry 4.0. Then he showed his disagreement to Jokowi by saying “*saya bukan pesimis Pak...*”

2. Positive Politeness (PP)

- Exaggerating

Datum 10 (PRA/140/D2)

Jadi, saya menyambut baik dinamika perkembangan apa itu, bisnis seperti itu. Ini luar biasa pesatnya dan ini memungkinkan membuka peluang-peluang luar biasa. Jadi, saya sangat mendukung hal-hal seperti itu, terima kasih.

The utterance above shows the response from Prabowo in answering Jokowi's question about his opinion regarding the development of unicorns in Indonesia. Prabowo used sub-strategy Exaggerating. It can be seen a word “*Luar Biasa*” said by him to show his deep interest in it.

- Giving gift

Datum 29 (JKW/153/D2)

Rakyat Indonesia yang saya cintai, mengelola negara sebesar Indonesia ini tidak mudah, tidak gampang. Sangat beruntung sekali, saya memiliki pengalaman mengelola sebuah kota, sebagai walikota kemudian mengelola provinsi sebagai gubernur di DKI Jakarta dan 4,5 tahun ini mengelola negara kita, Indonesia.

Jokowi gave a gift to hearers by saying “*yang saya cintai..*” because to be loved, cared and admired are considered as a gift.

3. Negative Politeness (NP)

- Being indirect

Datum 30 (JKW/153D2)

...mengelola negara sebesar Indonesia ini tidak mudah, tidak gampang. Sangat beruntung sekali, saya memiliki pengalaman mengelola sebuah kota, sebagai walikota kemudian mengelola provinsi sebagai gubernur di DKI Jakarta dan empat setengah tahun ini mengelola negara kita, Indonesia. Butuh sebuah ketegasan, butuh sebuah keberanian dalam membuat kebijakan-kebijakan untuk kebaikan negara ini.

From the utterance, it was indicated that Jokowi gave a signal that only him who was eligible to become the next president.

- Giving deference

Datum 32 (PRA/8/D4)

Pak Jokowi yang saya hormati, saya kira dalam hal ini, kita sebetulnya pada esensinya tidak jauh berbeda.

Prabowo gave deference to Jokowi by saying “*Pak Jokowi yang saya hormati*”.

4. Off-Record (OR)

- Overstating

Datum 39 (PRA/33/D4)

Jadi bukan saya tidak percaya, saya ini TNI, Pak. saya pertaruhkan nyawa di TNI. Saya lebih TNI dari banyak TNI.

From the statement above, Prabowo exaggerated or chose a point of view on scale which higher than the actual state of affair by saying “*Saya lebih TNI dari banyak TNI*”.

- Using contradictions

Datum 41 (JKW/48/D4)

Bukan tidak, tetapi diperkirakan, intelijen strategis diperkirakan. Ini perkiraan. Yang namanya perkiraan bisa, bisa betul tetapi juga bisa keliru.

From the situation above, Jokowi stated two things that contradict each other, “*betul or keliru*”. By stating the contradictions, he made it appear that he could not be telling the truth.

From the explanations above it can be seen that both candidates were equally dominant choosing Positive Politeness for

them to apply in both debates; the second and the fourth debates. What makes them more dominant in the strategy is due to the existence of the sub-strategy Offering, promising since the presidential debate is one of the form of the campaign so they needed to offer or promise something for the welfare of the people. But, it does not mean that they did not care about other sub-strategies in the PP. They also liked to apply Avoiding disagreement, especially Prabowo. He often used Avoiding disagreement when he responded to the Jokowi's statements in order to safe topics. Meanwhile Jokowi, he liked to show his optimism by applying 'Being optimistic' sub-strategy. In other types of politeness strategies, such as BOR, NP and OR, they preferred to apply Giving suggestion, Question, hedge and Rhetorical question.

In addition, if Jokowi always used the positive politeness strategy dominantly more than the other strategies in the two debates, Prabowo preferred to use both positive politeness and off-record strategies in the second and fourth debates. He used both of them dominantly in the fourth debate. By using off-record, Prabowo wanted to let the hearer to interpret the utterances he left up.

D. Conclusion and Suggestion

There were four types of politeness strategies used by Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto in the second and the fourth presidential debates 2019. They were Bald-On Record (BOR), Positive Politeness (PP), Negative Politeness (NP) and Off-Record (OR). Prabowo was the candidate who applied politeness strategies more than Jokowi. Among all strategies, Positive Politeness (PP) was found as the dominant strategy include both debates.

In realizing those politeness strategies, Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto utilized their own sub-strategies. There were 30 sub-strategies in the second debate and 33 sub-strategies in the fourth debate.

The reason of the dominant type found in this research because the candidates wanted to omit any gaps, not only with fellow candidates but also with the

audiences. Giving good sense and choosing words selectively in order to the audiences not to set offended and also they want to convey their campaign to attract voters since this is a political debate.

Finally, this research found that there were two main purposes of Politeness Strategy in the debate. The first was to satisfy hearer's positive face and the second was to safe negative face. Politeness strategy in addition can be used to bridges the relationship between speaker and hearer. It also can be used to stress an argument, to give criticism and to convince the hearer about any statements.

The suggestion that can be drawn is aimed for the students, English teacher, and other readers. For the students, especially English Department, are suggested to learn more about politeness strategies in order to get the clear understanding about politeness strategies especially in the debate. However, each person has his/her own strategies based on hid/her environment. In the debate, we use politeness strategies to convey the argumet to convince the hearer. For the English teachers, this research can be a reference to teach English subject particularly in teaching speaking, delivering opinion, and the respond in the debate. For other readers, this research can give contribution for everyone especially debaters who use politeness strategies to their conversation in order to make their language much better.

E. References

- Arcia, J. J. (2014). A Pragmatic Analysis of Positive Politeness Strategies as Reflected by the Characters in Carnage Movie. *Thesis*. Yogyakarta State University.
- Brown, P. and S. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freely, Austin. J and David L. Steinberg. (2009). *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making* (12th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

- Hasmi, M. (2013). A Pragmatic Analysis of Politeness Strategies Reflected in Nanny Mcphee Movie. *Thesis*. Yogyakarta State University.
- Islahudin. (2013). *3 Kata kasar Ahok yang dianggapkebablasan*.
<https://www.merdeka.com/jakarta/3-kata-kasar-ahok-yangdianggapkebablasan.html>. Retrieved on 10 July 2019.
- Jazeri, M. (2018). Communication Culture in Political Debate in Indonesia. *Knowledge E: The 1st International Seminar on Language, Literature and Education*, 364-376.
- Kádár, D. Z. And Haugh M. (2013). *Understanding Politeness (1st ed)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, M. B and Huberman A. M. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook (3rd ed.)*. London: Sage.
- Mubarakan, Munzalan. (2015). *Mengumpat saat live di TV, begini cara Ahok minta maaf*.
<https://simomot.com/2015/03/21/mengumpat-saat-live-di-tv-begini-caraahok-minta-maaf/>. Retrieved on 10 July 2019.
- Rmo1Jakarta. (2015). *Ahok Sudah Keterlaluhan dan Tidak Sopan*.
<http://www.rmo1jakarta.com/read/2015/03/19/1632/Ahok-Sudah-Keterlaluhan-dan-Tidak-Sopan->. Retrieved on 10 July 2019.
- Sibarani, J. G. And Marlina L. (2018). Politeness Strategy Used in Republican Debate by Donald Trump. *E-Journal of English Language & Literature*, 7 (4), 531-534.
- Yellowcabin. (2015). *Mengamati Gaya Komunikasi Ahok*.
<http://yellowcabin.com/mengamati-gaya-komunikasi-ahok/>. Retrieved on 17 July 2019.